

BRILL'S STUDIES IN INTELLECTUAL HISTORY

General Editor

A.J. VANDERJAGT, University of Groningen

Editorial Board

M. COLISH, Oberlin College

J.I. ISRAEL, University College, London

J.D. NORTH, University of Groningen

H.A. OBERMAN, University of Arizona, Tucson

R.H. POPKIN, Washington University, St. Louis-UCLA

VOLUME 52



RELIGIOUS POLEMIC
AND THE INTELLECTUAL HISTORY
OF THE MOZARABS, c. 1050-1200

BY

THOMAS E. BURMAN



E.J. BRILL
LEIDEN · NEW YORK · KÖLN
1994

The paper in this book meets the guidelines for permanence and durability of the Committee on Production Guidelines for Book Longevity of the Council on Library Resources.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Burman, Thomas E.

Religious polemic and the intellectual history of the Mozarabs,
c. 1050-1200 / by Thomas E. Burman.

p. cm. — (Brill's studies in intellectual history, 0920-8607
; ISSN v. 52)

Includes text of *Liber denudationis siue ostensionis aut
patefaciens* in English and Latin.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 9004099107 (alk. paper)

1. Mozarabs—History. 2. Christianity and other religions—Islam.
3. Islam—Relations—Christianity. 4. Apologetics—History—Middle
Ages, 600-1500. 5. Mozarabic literature—History and criticism.
I. *Liber denudationis siue ostensionis aut patefaciens*. English and
Latin. II. Title. III. Series.

BR1024.B87 1994

261.2'7'094609021—dc20

94-33776

CIP

Die Deutsche Bibliothek - CIP-Einheitsaufnahme

Burman, Thomas E.:

Religious polemic and the intellectual history of the Mozarabs,
c. 1050 - 1200 / by Thomas E. Burman. - Leiden ; New York ;
Köln : Brill, 1994

(Brill's studies in intellectual history ; Vol. 52)

ISBN 90-04-09910-7

NE: GT

ISSN 0920-8607

ISBN 90 04 09910 7

© Copyright 1994 by E.J. Brill, Leiden, The Netherlands

*All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in
a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic,
mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written
permission from the publisher.*

*Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal
use is granted by E.J. Brill provided that
the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright
Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910
Danvers MA 01923, USA.
Fees are subject to change.*

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

For ELIZABETH and DAVID

and

In Memory of my Grandmother

MABEL IDE MORTENSEN

a woman of learning, wisdom, and charity.

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	ix
A Note on Transliteration and Other Matters of Form	xi
Short Titles	xiii
Introduction	1

PART ONE

1 The Mozarabic Community in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries	13
2 The Sources: Mozarabic Apologetic and Anti-Islamic Polemic, c. 1050-1200	33
<i>Liber denudationis</i> (alias <i>Contrarietas alfolica</i>)	37
<i>The Letter of al-Qūṭī</i>	62
<i>Tathlīth al-waḥdānīyah</i>	70
The <i>Maṣḥaf al-‘ālam al-kā’in</i> of Aghushtīn	80
The Annotator of Robert of Ketton’s Translation of the Qur’ān	84
Supplemental Sources	89
3 The Oriental-Christian Contribution to Mozarabic Apologetic and Polemic	95
4 “That Which His Followers Related From Him”: The Mozarabs’ Polemical Use of Islamic Tradition	125

5 Abelard's Triad and Christian <i>Kalām</i> in Spain: Latin Theology in Mozarabic Apologetic.....	157
6 Conclusion	191

PART TWO

An Edition and Translation of *Liber denudationis siue
ostensionis aut patefaciens* (alias *Contrarietas alfolica*)

Introduction	215
Latin Text	240
English Translation	241
Appendix	387
Bibliography	389
Index.....	403

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I have incurred a thousand debts in the writing of this book. The research for it was carried out under University of Toronto Open Fellowships in 1989-90 and 1990-91 when it was still at the doctoral dissertation stage. A Rockefeller Foundation Research Fellowship at the Center for the Study of Islamic Societies and Civilizations (CSISC) at Washington University in St. Louis, Missouri, gave me a year off from teaching in 1992-93, during which time I was able to do further research and to rework the manuscript substantially. Thanks are especially due to a number of scholars who lent their expertise in various ways to the completion of this book: Alexander Knysh now of the University of Northern Colorado with whom I spent a delightful year in St. Louis, and who read almost all of the manuscript at various stages and offered many useful comments; Rosalind Gwynne of the University of Tennessee who painstakingly checked my Arabic transcriptions and translations; James Shelton of the University of Tennessee who did likewise for my Latin transcriptions and translations, and read and commented on all of my edition and translation of *Liber denudationis*; Virginia Brown of the University of Toronto and Blake Beattie of the University of Louisville both of whom read and commented on the whole of that edition and translation; Sean Mulrooney of the University of Toronto who offered valuable advice on translating certain difficult passages of the *Liber denudationis*; Ahmet Karamustafa, Peter Heath, and Cornell Fleischer all of the CSISC at Washington University who all read parts of the manuscript and offered their learned advice; Thomas F. Glick of Boston University who read and commented on the work at both the dissertation stage and in the rewritten form; W. Bruce Wheeler, my colleague in the history department of the University of Tennessee, who graciously proofread the final version of the work; Robert P. Williams, my graduate student here at

the University of Tennessee, whom I was able to hire, thanks to a grant from this university, to help me index the book. Most especially I must thank my two graduate school supervisors at the University of Toronto, J. N. Hillgarth and G. M. Wickens, who oversaw the original research and writing of the dissertation, and gave abundantly of their time and learning in the process, the latter also reading the whole work in its final form and offering many valuable suggestions. I hope that the final product measures up to their exacting standards of scholarship. All these scholars saved me from many errors large and small; any errors that remain, however, are solely my responsibility. Thanks are due as well to A. J. Vanderjagt, who encouraged me to have my book published in the series of which he is editor, and to Elisabeth Erdman-Visser, my managing editor at Brill, who amiably tolerated my slowness in completing the manuscript. Finally to my wife, Elizabeth Raney Burman, I owe more thanks than I can express, not only for her extensive and always useful advice on stylistic matters, but also for her long-enduring patience with a husband whose book sometimes consumed him.

June 28, 1994
Knoxville, Tennessee

A NOTE ON TRANSLITERATION AND OTHER MATTERS OF FORM

In this study I have adopted with only minor variations the Library of Congress system for Romanizing Arabic as described in the following publications: *Cataloguing Service* 18 (Summer, 1976):15-21; vol. 125 (Spring, 1978):23; *Cataloguing Service Bulletin* 6 (Fall, 1979):44; vol. 46 (Fall, 1989):79-89. Names of contemporary Arab scholars who write in both Arabic and a western language are given in the form which they themselves have adopted in their western publications, e. g., *Khalil Samir* and *Abdelmajid Charfi* rather than *Khalil Samir* and *'Abd al-Majid al-Sharfi*.

In the interest of keeping footnotes as short as possible, references to modern scholarly works will normally include only the author's name and a short title of the article or book in question; full bibliographical information can be found in the bibliography. References to medieval works other than the main sources that I have used will likewise include the author's name together with the title of the work, section or chapter number (where possible), and page number (or folio number if a manuscript is cited); full bibliographical information on these works can also be found in the bibliography. On the other hand, the essential medieval Arabic and Latin sources upon which this study is based will normally be referred to only by a short title: these short titles are given in the immediately-following list of short titles and abbreviations.

All translations from the Arabic, Latin, and other languages are mine.

Two important works relevant to this study appeared too late for me to benefit from their findings: 1] the second edition of Norman Daniel's magisterial study of medieval Western views of Islam, *Islam and the West: The Making of an Image*, rev. ed., Oxford: One World Press, 1993; 2] Dominique Urvoy's pene-

trating study of the meaning of the word *Mozarab*, “Les aspects symboliques du vocable «mozarabe»,” *Studia Islamica* 78 (1993):117-53. Both these works are destined to be the standard treatment of their respective topics.

SHORT TITLES

Abū Dāwūd	Abū Dāwūd Sulaymān ibn al-Ash'ath al-Sijistānī. <i>Sunan Abī Dāwūd</i> , 5 vols, ed. Muḥammad 'Alī al-Sayyid, Hims, 1969-74. References will include title number and name, volume number and page.
Aghushūn	Mozarabic apologetic fragments attributed to one Agushtūn and preserved in al-Qurṭubī (see below).
Annotator	Anonymous twelfth-century annotator of Robert of Ketton's translation of the Qur'ān in its earliest ms. (Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, lat. 1162).
al-Bayḍāwī	'Abd Allāh ibn 'Umar al-Bayḍāwī. <i>Anwār al-tanzīl wa-asrār al-ta'wīl</i> , ed. H. O. Fleischer, <i>Beidhawī commentarius in Coranum</i> 2 vols. 1846-48, reprint Osnabrück, 1968. References include number of verse commented on, volume number and page number.
<i>Bibliographie</i>	R. Caspar, et al. <i>Bibliographie du dialogue islamo-chrétien</i> , published successively in <i>Islamochristiana</i> beginning with volume 1 (1975). References include the entry number plus volume number, date, and page.
al-Bukhārī	Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl al-Bukhārī. <i>al-Jāmi' al-ṣaḥīḥ</i> , 4 vols., ed. M. L. Krehl and T. W. Juynboll, Leiden, 1862-1908. References are to title, section, and ḥadīth number.
CCCM	<i>Corpus christianorum, continuatio medievalis.</i>
CCSL	<i>Corpus christianorum, series latina.</i>
CSCO	<i>Corpus scriptorum christianorum orientalium.</i>
CSEL	<i>Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum.</i>
DTC	<i>Dictionnaire de théologie catholique.</i>
EI ¹	<i>Encyclopaedia of Islam</i> 1st ed.
EI ²	<i>Encyclopaedia of Islam</i> 2nd ed.
<i>Glossarium</i>	Anonymous. <i>Glossarium latino-arabicum ex unico qui extat codice Leidensi undecimo saeculo in</i>

- hispania conscripto*, ed. C. F. Seybold, (*Ergänzungsheft zur Zeitschrift für Assyriologie; Semitistische Studien* 15-17) Berlin, 1900.
- Ḥafṣ ibn Albar Andalusī-Christian apologetic fragments attributed to Ḥafṣ ibn Albar and preserved in al-Qurṭubī (see below).
- HIE *Historia de la iglesia en España* 5 vols., ed. R. García-Villoslada, et al., Madrid, 1979-.
- Ibn Ḥanbal Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal, *Musnad al-Imām Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal*, 6 vols., Beirut, 1895. References are to volume number and page.
- Ibn Ishāq Muḥammad ibn Ishāq. *Strat rasūl Allāh*, ed. F. Wüstenfeld, *Das Leben Muhammads nach Muhammad Ibn Ishāk, bearbeitet von Abd el-Malik Ibn Hishām*, 2 vols. Göttingen 1858, reprint 1961.
- Ibn Kathīr Abū al-Fidā' al-Ḥāfiẓ ibn Kathīr al-Dimashqī. *Tafsīr al-Qur'ān al-'aẓīm*, 4 vols., ed. Ḥusayn Ibrāhīm Zahrān, Beirut, 1986. References are to volume number and page.
- al-Khazraǧī Aḥmad ibn 'Abd al-Šamad. *Maqāmī' al-šulbān*, ed. 'Abd al-Majīd al-Sharfī, Tunis, 1975. References are to section and page number.
- Kitāb al-ḥurūf* An anonymous and fragmentary Christian apologetic work of Oriental origin quoted by al-Qurṭubī (see below).
- Liber denudationis* Anonymous. *Liber denudationis siue ostensionis aut patefaciens* (alias *Contrarietas alfolica*). References are to chapter and section number of my edition and translation in part two of this book.
- al-Muḥāwarah al-dīnīyah* 1 Ṭīmāthāwus al-Jāthliq. *al-Muḥāwarah al-dīnīyah allatī jarat bayna al-khalīfah al-Mahdī wa-Ṭīmāthāwus al-Jāthliq*, earliest recension, ed. R. Caspar in "Les versions arabes du dialogue entre le Catholicos Timothée I et le Calife al-Mahdī (IIe/VIIe siècle)," *Islamochristiana* 3 (1977):125-52.
- al-Muḥāwarah al-dīnīyah* 2 _____. Latest recension of the same work, ed. L. Cheikho (Shaykhuh), *al-Mashriq* 19 (1921):359-74, 408-19.
- Muslim Muslim ibn al-Ḥajjāj al-Qushayrī. *al-Šaḥīḥ*, 18 vols. in 9, 1981. References are to title number and name, volume number and page number.

- PL *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series latina.*
- PO *Patrologia orientalis.*
- Quadruplex reprobatio* Ramon Martí. *Quadruplex reprobatio*, Paris, B. N. lat. 4230 fols. 151vb-159rb.
- al-Qurṭubī al-Imām al-Qurṭubī. *al-F'lām bi-mā fī dīn al-naṣārā min al-fasād.* . . , ed. Aḥmad Ḥijāzī al-Saqqā, Cairo, 1980.
- al-Qūṭī The apologetic tract by the Mozarabic priest known as al-Qūṭī preserved in al-Khazrajī (see above).
- Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Qurṭubī Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Anṣārī al-Qurṭubī, *al-Jāmi' li-ahkām al-Qur'an*, 20 vols., Beirut, 1985. References are to volume number and page.
- Risālat al-Kindī* Anonymous. *Risālat 'Abd Allāh ibn Ismā'īl al-Hāshimī ilā 'Abd al-Masīḥ ibn Ishāq al-Kindī* . . . *wa-risālat 'Abd al-Masīḥ ilā al-Hāshimī* . . . , ed. A. Tien, London, 1885.
- al-Ṭabarī Muḥammad ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī. *Jāmi' al-bayan 'an ta'wīl āy al-Qur'an*, 30 vols. in 12, ed. Muḥammad Maḥmūd al-Ḥalabī, Cairo, 1968. References include number of verse commented on, volume number and page.
- Tathlūth al-waḥdānīyah* Anonymous Mozarabic apologetic tract preserved in al-Qurṭubī (see above).
- al-Tirmidhī Muḥammad ibn 'Isā al-Tirmidhī. *Sunan al-Tirmidhī*, 10 vols, Ḥims, 1969. References include title number and name, volume number and page.
- al-Ṭūsī Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan al-Ṭūsī. *al-Tibyān fī tafsīr al-Qur'an*, 10 vols., Najaf, 1376/1957-1383/1963. References include number of verse commented on, volume and page number.
- al-Zamakhsharī Muḥmūd ibn 'Umar al-Zamakhsharī. *al-Kashshāf 'an ḥaqā'iq ghawāmiḍ al-tanzīl wa-'uyūn al-aqāwīl fī wujūh al-ta'wīl* 4 vols., Beirut 1366/1947. References include number of verse commented on, volume and page number.

INTRODUCTION

During his famous raid into al-Andalus in 1125-26, Alfonso I, the Christian king of Aragon, encountered a number of Christian communities living under Islamic rule.¹ The contemporary Norman historian Orderic Vitalis reported, in fact, that at one point during this raid some ten thousand of these Christian subjects of Muslim rulers gathered together to appeal to Alfonso to help them flee to Christian Spain. In the course of this appeal, these Christian natives of Islamic Spain commented on their complex cultural and religious circumstances:

We and our forefathers up to the present have been reared among infidels, and [yet], having been baptized, we freely embrace the Christian religion.²

Orderic was far from southern Spain when he wrote these words, and the source for his observations is not known. Yet Orderic's account of the ambiguity felt by Christians living in Islamic Spain rings true, for in the twelfth century there were indeed a large number of baptized Catholics who had been reared among Muslims in al-Andalus, Catholics who had adopted the Arabic language, taken Arabic names, and acquired Arabic customs all without ceasing to embrace the Christian religion.

Such Spanish Christians reared among the Muslims have long been referred to in Spanish as *Mozárabes* and in English as *Mozarabs*. Both words are derived, apparently, from the Arabic *musta'rab* or *musta'rib* meaning "arabicized" or "one who claims

¹ On these encounters see F. Simonet, *Historia de los mozárabes de España*, ch. 39, pp. 745-57, and esp. V. Lagardère, "Communautés mozarabes et pouvoir almoravide," *passim*.

² "Nos, inquit, et patres nostri hactenus inter gentiles educati sumus, et baptizati Christianam legem libenter tenemus" (Orderic Vitalis, *Historia ecclesiastica* 13.6, vol. 6, pp. 404-06, cf. F. Simonet, *Historia de los mozárabes de España*, pp. 747-48). For the translation of *gentiles* as "non-Christians," see D. Millet-Gérard, *Chrétiens mozarabes et culture islamique*, pp. 31-32.

to be an Arab".³ The Mozarabs are one of the unusual ethnic groups which developed in the Iberian peninsula as a result of medieval Spain's pluralistic circumstances: for centuries Christendom and the Islamic empire met and overlapped there, and for generations a very large minority of Jews likewise called Islamic or Christian Spain home. The Mozarabs' exact counterparts were the so-called *Mudejars*—Muslims who lived for generations under Christian rule.

Unlike the Mudejars and the Spanish Jews, however, who have been the subjects of very extensive study in our times,⁴ the Mozarabs of the twelfth century and later are in some respects "a forgotten community" as far as modern scholarship is concerned.⁵ Though a great deal has been written about the Spanish Christians living under Islamic rule in the early Middle Ages, the Mozarabs of the period after about the year 1000 have received relatively little scholarly attention.⁶ This is especially so with regard to their

³ The precise etymology of this word and its original meaning as applied to Christians in Spain is still a topic of some controversy; for bibliography, see M. de Epalza, "Mozarabs: an Emblematic Christian Minority," p. 148, "Mozarab," *EI*² 7:246-47 [art. P. Chalmeta].

⁴ For brief introductions to Mudejar studies together with abundant bibliography see J. O'Callaghan, "The Mudejars of Castile and Portugal," *passim*, and J. Burns, "Muslims in the Thirteenth-Century Realms of Aragon," *passim*. On the Jews of Spain see especially E. Ashtor, *The Jews of Moslem Spain*, and Y. Baer, *A History of the Jews in Christian Spain*.

⁵ The quote is from D. Wasserstein, *The Rise and Fall of the Party States*, p. 224, but see also P. Guichard's very important reflections on the historiography of the Mozarabs in his "Les Mozarabes de Valence et d'al-Andalus," p. 20; and C.-E. Dufourcq, "Les Mozarabes du Xlle siècle," p. 125. One must note, however, that certain very important contributions to the study of the Mozarabs in this period have been made in the last two decades. Mostly notably, see Wasserstein, *The Rise and Fall of the Party States* ch. 8, pp. 224-46; R. Pastor de Togneri, "Problèmes d'assimilation d'une minorité. Les Mozarabes de Tolède," *passim*; Id., *Del Islam al Cristianismo*, *passim*; V. Lagardère, "Communautés mozarabes et pouvoir almoravide," *passim*. See also the many articles referred to below in chapter one, n. 28, on the heavily disputed question of whether and where sizable communities of Mozarabs existed in the twelfth century and afterward.

⁶ The bibliography on the early period is sizable; see esp. A. Cortabarría Beitia, "Les études mozarabes en Espagne," *passim*; but also J. Rivera Recio, "La iglesia mozarabe," *HIE* 2/1, pp. 21-22; "Mozarab," *EI*² 7:246-49 [art. P. Chalmeta]; M. de Epalza, "Mozarabs: an Emblematic Christian Minority," pp. 167-70; and K. Wolf, "Christian Views of Islam," *passim*. For the later period

intellectual and religious history. With the notable exceptions of the fine studies of P. Sj. van Koningsveld and Francisco Hernández,⁷ scholarship regarding the inner life of the Mozarabs in the eleventh through thirteenth centuries has not progressed markedly beyond the point to which Francisco Javier Simonet brought it more than a century ago in his *Historia de los Mozárabes de España*,⁸ and even Simonet had relatively little to say about the period after 1085.

This book is an attempt to ameliorate this situation. It is a study of eleventh- and twelfth-century Mozarabic intellectual history based on one of the few collections of sources of any kind which has survived to tell us about it: the rather small corpus of extant religious-controversial literature written by the Mozarabs in the period from roughly 1050 to 1200. Intellectual history can, of course, mean many different things. What I have attempted here is to evaluate the Mozarabic intellectual milieu by determining what these short and often fragmentary religious-controversial works can tell us about the sorts of books learned Mozarabs typically read. The assumptions underlying my approach are that, as Manuel Díaz y Díaz succinctly put it, books are "the most important cultural vehicle" of the Middle Ages,⁹ and that by learning about the traffic in these "cultural vehicles" within a given community we can reasonably expect to arrive at some understanding of the quality of its intellectual life. By learning, therefore, what books Mozarabs read, and, more importantly, by discovering what they did with what they read, I have tried to come to some conclu-

see the following pages of this introduction. The lack of attention given to Mozarabs in the twelfth century and later in both the recent *Encyclopedia of Islam* article cited just above and M. de Epalza's "Mozarabs: an Emblematic Christian Minority," is an index of how poorly this part of Mozarabic history is understood currently.

⁷ See P. van Koningsveld, "La apología de al-Kindī," passim; id., "La literatura cristiano-árabe," passim; and id., *The Latin-Arabic Glossary* passim; and F. Hernández, "Language and Cultural Identity," pp. 29-48; G. Levi della Vida's earlier "I Mozarabi" should be mentioned in this connection as well.

⁸ See also his *Glosario de voces*, esp. the introduction: "Primera parte. Estudio sobre el dialecto hispano-mozárabe," pp. vii-cxxvi.

⁹ See his *Libros y librerías en la Rioja altomedieval*, p. 16.

sions about the relative vitality and creativity of the Mozarabic intellectual milieu in these centuries.¹⁰ That, at any rate, is the primary purpose of this study.

But it is not the only one. In writing their apologetic and polemical works, the Mozarabs, as Norman Daniel demonstrated three decades ago, played a key role in the development of the medieval European understanding of and approach to Islam in general.¹¹ But it has never been entirely clear just what that role was: were the Mozarabs primarily transmitters of texts and ideas about Islam originally composed and conceived of by Oriental Arab Christians? Or did they contribute anything original to that European approach to Islam?¹² In piecing together what we can of the intellectual history of the Mozarabs as it is preserved in their religious-controversial writings, therefore, we also have the opportunity to refine our understanding of how medieval and later Europeans came to believe what they did about the Islamic world.

These religious-controversial works that are the essential sources upon which this study is based also determine its temporal boundaries. There were apologetic and polemical works written by Arabic-speaking Christians in Spain before 1050 and perhaps after 1200.¹³ But it is only during this century and a half that we have anything like a large and coherent enough corpus of works to be of much more than anecdotal interest; for this period, which saw the political circumstances of the Peninsula change so profoundly,

¹⁰ On the circulation of books in general in medieval Spain see especially the many works of M. Díaz y Díaz: "La circulation des manuscrits dans la Péninsule Ibérique"; "La vida literaria entre los mozarábes de Toledo"; "La transmisión de los textos antiguos en la Península Ibérica;" "Agustín entre los mozarábes"; "Textos altomedievales extrahispanos en la península"; and the book listed in the previous note. See also J. Divjak, "La présence de saint Augustin en Espagne"; K. Reinhardt, "Bibel und Kultur in Toledo zur Zeit der reconquista"; and id., "Biblia y cultura en la época de la reconquista."

¹¹ See N. Daniel, *Islam and the West*, pp. 3, 12, 275.

¹² Daniel himself thought their role was primarily of the former variety; see N. Daniel, *Islam and the West*, pp. 5, 12.

¹³ See chapter two below. Marc of Toledo's brief preface to his translation of the Qur'an, written in the early thirteenth century could be considered an apologetic treatise, but it is rather short; for an edition of it see M.-Th. d'Alverny and G. Vajda, "Marc de Tolède, traducteur," pp. 260-68.

also witnessed, for reasons I will comment upon in the next chapter, a pronounced increase in anti-Islamic polemic on the part of Mozarabs.

In taking up the study of these religious-controversial works in Part One of this book, however, we are entering into an unfortunately hazy and anonymous world. None of their authors' names are known for sure, and in general the circumstances of their composition—date, location, motivation, etc.—are rather unclear as well. Therefore, after describing the situation of the Mozarabic community in which these apologetic and polemical works originated (ch. 1), I will address these occasionally tedious questions of authorship and provenance at some necessary length (ch. 2).

Having addressed these questions, I then will demonstrate that the unknown Mozarabic authors of these religious-controversial works were reading at least three very different categories of books as they attempted to confront the religion of the Prophet intellectually. First of all, they had an extensive knowledge of the Arabic apologetic writings of earlier and perhaps contemporary Oriental Christians, and fashioned their own apologetic and polemical works very much within that earlier Arab-Christian tradition (ch. 3). Second, they also read widely in the foundational texts of Islam itself—the Qur'ān and Islamic Tradition—and used information drawn directly from these texts to supplement what they had learned of Islam and how to combat it from the Arabic writings of Oriental Christians, using, in effect, Islam's own sacred texts against Muslims themselves (ch. 4). Finally, although the Mozarabs were called by that name because they spoke and acted like Arabs, they typically also spoke a Romance dialect and, moreover, since they were in communion with the Roman Church, knowledge of Latin was not uncommon among them either.¹⁴ As a result, Mozarabic intellectuals interested in defending their Christian faith could draw on Latin-Christian theology as well, which is precisely what some of them did, combining contemporary Latin insights into the nature of the Trinity with tradi-

¹⁴ This bi- and tri-lingualism will be discussed at greater length in chapter one below.

tional Oriental Arab-Christian arguments for the soundness of that doctrine (ch.5).

This ability to draw on and, in some cases, intermingle ideas and methods drawn from three very different kinds of books and two different languages and cultures indicates that the intellectual milieu of the eleventh- and twelfth-century Mozarabs was not nearly so moribund as it has been portrayed.¹⁵ This suggests that the dramatically changed circumstances in which the Mozarabs increasingly found themselves during this century and a half engendered intellectual renewal: their gradual transition in these years from religious minority community living under Islamic rule to linguistic and ethnic minority community living under Christian rule stimulated the Mozarabic intellectual milieu, at least initially. Ironically, however, these same changed circumstances would later cause the total dissolution of the Mozarabs as a separate ethnic group by the late fourteenth century, for eventually the Mozarabs would completely assimilate to the Latin/Romance culture in which they were now immersed, and cease to speak Arabic.¹⁶ Yet although by the beginning of the fourteenth century this assimilation was nearly complete, a significant intellectual legacy of the eleventh- and twelfth-century Mozarabs was alive and well in the hands of the great evangelical-Orientalists Ramon Lull and Ramon Martí and others like them whose own approaches to Islam owed much more than has previously been noticed to the earlier Mozarabic approach to Islam (ch. 6).

This exploration of the connections between twelfth-century Mozarabic anti-Islamic polemic and that of those later Latin missionaries concludes Part One of this book. Part Two consists of a critical edition and translation of the longest of the religious-controversial works which are this study's essential sources. Though originally written in Arabic, this treatise is now extant only in a medieval-Latin translation called *Liber denudationis siue ostensionis aut patefaciens* (alias *Contrarietas alfolica*). While this

¹⁵ Especially by D. Wasserstein, *The Rise and Fall of the Party States*, p. 234.

¹⁶ On the linguistic impact of this change of circumstances see F. Hernández' "Language and Cultural Identity," pp. 29-47.

work has been known and studied by a handful of scholars in the years since the late Professor d'Alverny first wrote about it in the late 1940s, it has remained unedited and unpublished even though it is the longest and, in some ways, most remarkable monument of eleventh- and twelfth-century Mozarabic intellectual history. My edition and translation with commentary appear on facing pages in Part Two together with an introduction in which a variety of textual problems are discussed.

At about the same time as Orderic Vitalis' Mozarabs were reflecting on their anomalous circumstances, another Arabicized Spanish Christian, a Jewish convert named Petrus Alfonsi, likewise observed that although he had "read the books" of the Arab Muslims, and "knew their language," and "was always nurtured among [them]," nevertheless "it is not proper on that account that I should follow their religion."¹⁷ This statement is, in many ways, a description of what it meant to be a Mozarab. The chapters of this book, then, are an attempt to specify exactly what Arabic (and Latin) books such Christians had read who had been "nurtured" among the Muslims but who had not "on that account followed their religion."

*

A note on terminology. It has been known since at least Simonet's time that the term "Mozarab" is a problematic one. As he and later historians have pointed out, Muslim Arabic writers never used this term to refer to Iberian Christians, preferring instead such words as *rūmī* ("Roman, Byzantine"), *naṣārā* ("Christian," "Nazarene"), and *mu'āhid* ("keeper of the covenant," i. e. one who has entered into a pact with the Islamic rulers). *Musta'rab* (or *musta'rib*) and its Romance variants—*muzaraves*, *muztarabes*, *mozarabes*, etc.—only appear in Christian texts beginning in the

¹⁷ Petrus Alfonsi, *Dialogus* 5, PL 157:602a (Petrus speaks here to his Jewish alter-ego, Moses): "Quod superius me libros legisse, linguam scire, nutritum fore semper inter Sarracenos dixisti, non idcirco convenit ut illorum assequar legem."

eleventh century.¹⁸ What this fact implies about the self-understanding of the Mozarabs, as well as the Latin-Christian views of them, is still very much under debate,¹⁹ but what is clear is that the term “Mozarab” has been used far too broadly by modern historians.²⁰ Everything from the *Latin* writings of largely un-Arabicized Christians in the early Middle Ages, to the *Romance* dialect of the Mozarabs, to the thoroughly un-Arabic Visigothic liturgical rite which Iberian Christians used have been referred to indifferently as “Mozarabic.” This has naturally caused a good deal of confusion and, what is worse, rendered this term ever less precise.²¹

Although in earlier related studies I adopted other terminology because of this ambiguity surrounding “Mozarab” and “Mozarabic,”²² I have decided to follow the general practice of Hispanists in this book for two reasons. First of all, the use of this venerable term shows no signs of dying out, as the titles of the many recent articles indicate.²³ But second and more importantly, the anonymous authors about whom I am writing here were, in fact, members of that Arabic-speaking Christian community who were originally referred to in the medieval sources as *Mozarabs* before the word came to be applied by later historians to all manner of other partially related phenomena: of all Iberian Christians they are the most deserving of it. I must stress, however, that, as the first chapter will make clear, the Mozarabic intellectual milieu

¹⁸ See F. Simonet, *Historia de los mozárabes de España*, pp. vii-xvii, “Mozarab,” *El*² 7:246-47 [art. P. Chalmeta], M. de Epalza, “Mozarabs: an Emblematic Christian Minority,” pp. 149-50.

¹⁹ See, for example, R. Hitchcock, “¿Quiénes fueron los verdaderos mozárabes?”; V. Cantarino, *Entre monjes y musulmanes*, p. 109; M. de Epalza and M. J. Rubiera, “Los cristianos toledanos bajo dominación musulmana,” p. 129.

²⁰ D. Urvoy has stressed this in his “La pensée religieuse des Mozarabes,” p. 419, as has M.-Th. Urvoy in her “La culture et la littérature arabe des chrétiens d'al-Andalus,” p. 259.

²¹ A. Cortabarría Beitia's otherwise extremely useful historiographical essay, “Les études mozarabes en Espagne,” is an egregious example of this.

²² I used the term “Arab Christian” in “The Influence of the *Apology of al-Kindī*,” and the term “Andalusī Christian” in “‘Tathlith al-wahdānīyah’”.

²³ E. g. M. de Epalza's “Mozarabs: an Emblematic Christian Minority,” and V. Lagardère, “Communautés mozarabes et pouvoir almoravide”.

in these centuries, like the wider Mozarabic community itself, was a surprisingly cosmopolitan one. Many of these Mozarabs were the descendents of ancient Romano-Gothic Christians whose ancestors became Arabic speakers under Islamic rule. But many were what Mikel de Epalza calls “Neo-Mozarabs” (Northern Europeans who had come to the Spanish frontier and picked up Arabic and so entered into the Mozarabic community) or “New Mozarabs” (converted Muslims who as Arabic-speakers naturally were at home among the original Mozarabs);²⁴ some were even *converso* Jews who likewise became part of the Mozarabic milieu. But in all cases, they were, as the name *Mozarab* in its original sense and usage seems to me to require, speakers of Arabic at home in Andalusī civilization.

But while I will use the term *Mozarab* to refer to the eleventh- and twelfth-century authors who are most important to this study, I will not use the term to refer to other Iberian Christians who spoke Arabic but who could not ever have been known in their day as Mozarabs. The apologist Ḥafṣ ibn Albar, for example, who lived in the ninth century, long before the term was applied to Iberian Christians, was certainly not a Mozarab in the strict sense, so I do not refer to him as such. Rather, I will refer to Christians such as Ḥafṣ, as well as to all Oriental Christians who wrote in Arabic, as *Arabicized Christians* or *Arab Christians* depending on the context.

²⁴ See M. de Epalza, “Mozarabs: an Emblematic Christian Minority,” pp. 150-51. This phenomenon will be discussed at greater length in the following chapter.

PART ONE
RELIGIOUS POLEMIC AND THE INTELLECTUAL
HISTORY OF THE MOZARABS, c. 1050-1200

CHAPTER ONE
THE MOZARABIC COMMUNITY
IN THE ELEVENTH AND TWELFTH CENTURIES

In the year 1156 an inscribed flagstone was embedded in the pavement to the right of the entrance of the church of Sts. Justa and Rufina in Toledo to honor the memory of a man named Michael Semeno. Recorded in Latin upon this slab was the date of this man's demise according to the Spanish era, this information preceded by the familiar phrase *In nomine domini nostri Iesu Christi*—"In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ . . ." In all this the monument is hardly unusual. But next to the Latin inscription there is a second inscription with much the same contents. This time, however, it is written in Arabic. Michael Semeno is now referred to as *Miqā'il* (sic) *ibn Samanuh*, and in place of *In nomine domini nostri Iesu Christi*, we have an equally well-known Arabic phrase: *Bismillāh al-raḥmān al-raḥīm*, "In the name of Allāh, the Merciful, the Compassionate."¹ These are the words so familiar to every Muslim which occur at the beginning of nearly every sūrah of the Qu'rān and stand at the head of many other documents written by Muslims, as well.

This bilingual epitaph, in addition to commemorating the death of one Michael Semeno, is also an eloquent symbol, in both its content and location, of the nature and circumstances of the Mozarabic community in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Mozarabs had long been Arabic speakers, and in the twelfth century that language was still very much alive among them. But in the course of becoming Arabicized, the Mozarabs had also become partially Islamicized—they were at home with Islamic books, familiar with Islamic religious language, imbued with typi-

¹ E. Lévi-Provençal, *Inscriptions arabes d'Espagne*, #81, p. 78; cf. #82, pp. 79-80.

cally Islamic patterns of thought. Nevertheless they and their ancestors had remained Christians, worshipping according to the Visigothic rite, speaking a Romance dialect in addition to Arabic, and, among the clergy at least, cultivating some knowledge of Latin. Though the Mozarabs had once been spread throughout al-Andalus, the twelfth century saw them congregate ever more completely in and around the city of Toledo after its return to Christian rule in 1085. Arabicized and partially Islamicized, yet Christian and Romance/Latin speaking as well, increasingly focused around the cultural center of newly-conquered Toledo—these characteristics of the Mozarabic community exemplified by Michael Semeno's epitaph are precisely the features of this frontier community which are most important for our understanding of its intellectual history.

Like Christians elsewhere who lived under Islamic rule, the Latin/Romance-speaking ancestors of the eleventh- and twelfth-century Mozarabs became Arabicized fairly quickly after the Arab-Muslim conquest of Iberia.² Mohamed Talbi has observed that Latin Christians living in North Africa began using Arabic names as early as the ninth century and that Arabic had become their official language by the tenth century.³ Similarly, we find Iberian Christians with Arabic names writing in the language of the Qur'ān by the later ninth century,⁴ the most striking example being Ḥaṣṣ ibn Albar al-Qūṭī ("Ḥaṣṣ the son of Alvarus the Goth")—the son, apparently, of the famous Latin writer Paulus Alvarus. Ḥaṣṣ (d. 889) not only made a remarkable verse translation of the Vulgate Psalms into Arabic, but also was the author of the first Christian Arabic apologetic treatise against Islam written by a western Christian in the Middle Ages. In his Psalm translation, moreover, he consciously attempted to follow the conven-

² For a fine introduction to the subject of Christians living under Islamic rule in the Middle Ages, see M. Gervers and R. Bikhazi, eds., *Conversion and Continuity*, passim; the various articles in this collection cover most of the Mediterranean Islamic world and provide abundant bibliography (though, unfortunately, the Mozarabs of the High Middle Ages are not treated at all).

³ M. Talbi, "Le Christianisme maghrébin," pp. 320, 323.

⁴ See H. Goussen, *Die christlich-arabische Literatur der Mozaraber*, p. 7; and P. van Koningsveld, "La literatura cristiano-árabe," pp. 695-700.

tions of good Arabic poetry.⁵

By the time of Ḥaḥṣ ibn Albar, therefore, Arabicization had already made considerable headway among Christians living in al-Andalus, and, as Professor Urvoy has observed, this Arabicization in many ways "enlarged the field of their possibilities," since they thereby became partakers in the much more advanced early-medieval Islamic civilization.⁶ Though the literary history of Spain's Arabicized Christians remains rather hazy for the most part, largely because so few of its monuments have been preserved for us,⁷ it is known that as early as the tenth century Arabic-speaking Christians such as Bishop Rabīʿ ibn Zayd (*alias* Recemundo) and Bishop Abū al-Ḥārith were studying Arabic philosophy, just as contemporary Andalusī Jews and Muslims were, and that the often highly rationalistic Arabic works of Nestorian Christians were already likewise circulating among them.⁸

This broader intellectual horizon would remain accessible to the Arabic-speaking Christians of Spain, as we will see in the next chapter, so long as they continued to speak Arabic, and it would

⁵ See P. van Koningsveld, "La literatura cristiano-árabe," pp. 695-700; M.-Th. Urvoy, "La culture et la littérature arabe des chrétiens d'al-Andalus," pp. 270, 273-75; D. Dunlop, "Ḥaḥṣ b. Albar—the Last of the Goths," pp. 136-51; id., "Sobre Ḥaḥṣ ibn Albar Al-Qūṭī al-Qurṭubī," pp. 211-13; D. Urvoy, *Pensers d'al-Andalus*, pp. 28-29. An edition of his Psalm translation by M.-Th. Urvoy will appear soon; the first few Psalms are published in Samir, "al-Turāth al-ʿarabī al-masīḥī," pp. 21-23. On his apologetic treatise against Islam see the beginning of the next chapter. On other ninth-century Christians in al-Andalus who knew Arabic see D. Millet-Gérard, *Chrétiens mozarabes et culture islamique*, pp. 53-62.

⁶ D. Urvoy, "La pensée religieuse des Mozarabes," p. 425. M.-Th. Urvoy demonstrates the influence of Arabic models on Andalusī-Christian manuscript illumination and music in the early Middle Ages; see her "La culture et la littérature arabe des chrétiens d'al-Andalus," pp. 263-65.

⁷ But see H. Goussen, *Die christlich-arabische Literatur der Mozaraber*, passim, and esp. P. van Koningsveld's "La literatura cristiano-árabe," passim.

⁸ See P. van Koningsveld, "La literatura cristiano-árabe," p. 702; D. Urvoy, *Pensers d'al-Andalus*, pp. 162, 172; and id., "La pensée religieuse des Mozarabes," pp. 421-25 and ff. On Rabīʿ ibn Zayd see F. Simonet, *Historia de los mozarabes de España*, pp. 603-28; D. Dozy and C. Pellat, *Le calendrier de Cordoue*, pp. vii-xv; and P. van Koningsveld, *ibid.*, pp. 700-03.

crucially influence their apologetic and polemical writings against Islam. But Arabicization did not just introduce these Christians to a far more vital and advanced intellectual milieu than contemporary Latin Christendom could offer; it also led to partial Islamicization among those who did not convert altogether to Islam.⁹ This could hardly be avoided since Arabic, as the language of the Qur'ān and Islamic Tradition, was intimately connected to the religion of Islam. From the moment Iberian Christians began expressing themselves in Arabic, therefore, they also began using surprisingly Islamic-sounding language in specifically Christian contexts.¹⁰ The *basmalah*—"In the Name of Allāh, the Merciful, the Compassionate"—which appears on Michael Semeno's epitaph likewise appears at the beginning of each of the Gospels in the Arabic translation made from the Old Latin version by the Andalusī Christian Ishāq ibn Balashk;¹¹ it stands at the head of an Arabic translation of a Latin canon-law collection;¹² it adorns each of the hundreds of extant Arabic archival documents pertaining to the Toledan Mozarabs.¹³ Countless other typically Islamic phrases likewise show up in the Mozarabs' Arabic, Romance, and Latin works.¹⁴

⁹ And of course most native Iberian Christians living under Islamic rule probably had already converted to Islam by the eleventh-century; for a summary of the various views about the rate of conversion see M. de Epalza, "Mozarabs: an Emblematic Christian Minority," pp. 157-60; see also P. Guichard, "Les Mozarabes de Valence et d'al-Andalus," pp. 17-27, esp. 21-24; and R. Bullett, *Conversion to Islam in the Medieval Period*, pp. 114-27.

¹⁰ K. Wolf, "Christian Views of Islam," emphasizes this early assimilation of the Iberian Christians to the Islamic milieu.

¹¹ See P. van Koningsveld, *The Latin-Arabic Glossary*, p. 54-56, esp. 55; and id., "La literatura cristiano-árabe," pp. 705-06.

¹² The *Kitāb al-qānūn al-muqaddas* on which see F. Simonet, *Historia de los mozárabes de España*, 720-31, 809-12; H. Goussen, *Die christlich-arabische Literatur der Mozaraber*, pp. 19-22; H. Kassis, "Muslim Revival in Spain," pp. 89-90, n. 40 (where he says that he is currently editing it); M.-Th. Urvoy, "La culture et la littérature arabe des chrétiens d'al-Andalus," pp. 268, 271; P. and van Koningsveld, "La literatura cristiano-árabe," pp. 695, 704-06, who dates it much earlier (mid-tenth century) than the traditional dating subscribed to by the other authors mentioned here (mid-eleventh).

¹³ See A. González-Palencia, *Los mozárabes de Toledo, Volumen preliminar*, p. 43.

¹⁴ See, e. g., A. González-Palencia, *Los mozárabes de Toledo, Volumen preliminar*, p. 43; and id., *Glosario de voces*, pp. ccxii-cxxv.

These Arabicized Christians in al-Andalus even quoted the Qur'ān, and sometimes did so with approval.¹⁵ In the introduction to an Arabic version of the Psalms completed before Ḥafṣ ibn Albar's we find that the second person of the Trinity is described as the "Word who created the heavens and the earth and that which is between them."¹⁶ Though there are passages of the Bible which say things very like this (e. g. Gn 1:1, Is 45:18, Ap 10:16), this statement is taken directly from the Qur'ān, where Allāh is said have "created the heavens, the earth, and that which is between them" (vv. 43:39, 50:38, etc.).¹⁷ This linguistic Islamicization occurred among Oriental Christians as well,¹⁸ and in both the Middle East and al-Andalus it led to friction within the Christian community.¹⁹ The Mozarabs continued to be heavily Arabicized and partially Islamicized during the century and half in which the bulk of their apologetic and polemical works were written; the familiarity which they demonstrate in those works with both Oriental Arab-Christian theology and the foundational texts of Islam is in one way merely the practical expression of this Arabicization *cum* partial-Islamicization.

Nevertheless, they continued to "embrace the Christian religion," as Orderic Vitalis' Mozarabs put it, keeping alive for that reason the Latin language, the cultivation of which was made a

¹⁵ See, e. g., R. Dozy and C. Pellat eds., *Le calendrier de Cordoue*, pp. 6-7 where Rabi' ibn Zayd quotes v. 28:76 to explain the meaning of a word; cf. P. van Koningsveld, "La literatura cristiano-árabe," p. 702.

¹⁶ "Wa-al-Ibn huwa al-kalimah allatī khalaqat al-samāwāt wa-al-arḍ wa-mā bayna-humā" (Vat. Ar. 5, fol. 1r; n.b. that the *Basmalah* stands out prominently at the head of this folio; and cf. H. Goussen, *Die christlich-arabische Literatur der Mozaraber*, pp. 13-15, 28-29; a photograph of this fol. is reproduced on p. 28. On this version of the Psalms see P. van Koningsveld, *The Latin-Arabic Glossary*, pp. 52-54).

¹⁷ See also *Liber denudationis* 10.10 where the second person of the Trinity is described in exactly the same way.

¹⁸ See, e. g., S. Griffith, "The First Christian *Summa Theologiae* in Arabic," pp. 20-24; and Kh. Samir, "al-Turāth al-masīhī al-ʿarabī," pp. 19-28; for an example see commentary to *Liber denudationis* 10.15 below.

¹⁹ See S. Griffith, "The First *Summa Theologiae* in Arabic," *passim*. K. Wolf has particularly stressed this in connection with early medieval Spain; see his "Christian Views of Islam," *passim*.

good deal easier in consequence of their continued use of a Romance vernacular as well.²⁰ The Latin works of the ninth-century Iberian Christians living under Islamic rule are well known, and thoroughly studied,²¹ and although there was a steep decline in the writing of Latin after the beginning of the tenth century,²² Andalusī Christians continued to worship according to the Latin rite, to manage their internal legal affairs according to the Latin *Liber judiciorum*,²³ and to copy Latin manuscripts.²⁴

By the twelfth century, when Michael Semeno's bi-lingual epitaph was made, a resurgence of interest in Latin was clearly underway. This can be seen particularly vividly, as Professor van Koningsveld has demonstrated, in the twelfth-century Mozarabic *Glossarium Latino-Arabicum*, a Latin-Arabic glossary intended to help Arabic-speaking Mozarabs read Latin. The abundant Arabic marginal notes written in this same period in Latin theological and canon-legal manuscripts likewise testify to a renewed interest among Mozarabs in their Latin heritage, as does the appearance in the early twelfth century of vulgar-Latin charters written by Mozarabs in Toledo for use alongside their many Arabic charters.²⁵

²⁰ Simonet made the case long ago for the continued use of Romance and Latin among the Arabic-speaking Christians of Spain (see his *Glosario de voces*, pp. ix-xxxviii); see A. Cortabarría Beitia, "Les études mozarabes en Espagne," pp. 16-20, 23-24 for modern bibliography on this subject, and cf. M. Barceló Torres, *Minorías islámicas en el país valenciano*, pp. 125-26; and A. Galmés de Fuentes, "La lengua de los mozarabes de Toledo," pp. 141-43 and ff.

²¹ They are edited in J. Gil, *Corpus scriptorum Muzarabicorum*, 2 vols., Madrid, 1973. For further bibliography see the beginning of the following chapter.

²² The greater part by far of the works edited by Gil (see previous note) are from the period up to the early tenth century; cf. J. Rivera Recio, "La iglesia mozarabe," HIE 2/1, pp. 58-59.

²³ See A. González-Palencia, *Los mozarabes de Toledo, Volumen preliminar*, pp. 118-22.

²⁴ See F. Simonet, *Historia de los mozarabes de España*, ch. 37, pp. 711 ff. for the eleventh century. For further evidence of the Mozarab's cultivation of their Latin heritage after the ninth century see M. Díaz y Díaz, "Agustín entre los mozarabes," passim; id., "La transmisión de los textos antiguos en la Península Ibérica," pp. 148-58; and K. Reinhart, "Biblia y cultura en la época de la reconquista," pp. 135-41 and passim.

²⁵ See the *Glossarium*, passim; cf. P. van Koningsveld, *The Latin-Arabic Glossary*, passim, esp. pp. 2-3, 44, 64-65; and F. Hernández, "Language and

This resurgence of Latinity among the Mozarabs was itself only the cultural consequence of the massive political, social, and economic shift experienced by them during the course of the twelfth century, the most salient result of which was the integration of most of the Mozarabic community into the Latin-Christian society of the Christian north. Though most of the original Romano-Gothic Christians of Iberia had long since converted to Islam by the beginning of that century, the Mozarabs probably still made up a very large minority of the population of the Peninsula.²⁶ While we are still poorly informed about the locations of Mozarabic communities in the Taifa period and later,²⁷ it is fairly certain that Mozarabic communities still existed throughout much of al-Andalus down to the end of the eleventh century, living more or less contentedly, as they had for centuries under Islamic rule. We know that communities of Mozarabs existed in such cities as

Cultural Identity," p. 36. For further evidence of this resurgence of interest in the Mozarabs' Latin heritage see M. Díaz y Díaz, "Breves notas sobre los mozárabes de Toledo," pp. 23-24; and J. M. Casciaro Ramirez, "Las glosas marginales árabes," passim, esp. 327-28.

²⁶ There is considerable debate on this question. B. Reilly, *The Contest of Christian and Muslim Spain*, pp. 17-21, argues that the Mozarabs may have made up as much as thirty per cent of the Peninsula's population in the eleventh century; this figure is, of course, highly speculative and would be challenged by M. de Epalza (see his "Mozarabs: an Emblematic Christian Minority," pp. 160-61) and others who argue that there were very few true Mozarabs left in the Peninsula and that those who did remain were so-called Neo-Mozarabs or New Mozarabs (see esp. his "La islamización de al-Andalus," pp. 171-79, esp. p. 174, and cf. the further articles cited just below in n. 28). I am in agreement with Professor Guichard that Epalza's views on this subject, though rather instructive in many ways, tend to overestimate the decline of the Mozarabic population; see his "Les Mozarabes de Valence et d'al-Andalus," p. 23; and cf. D. Wasserstein, *The Rise and Fall of the Party-Kings*, pp. 225-27, and Ch-E. Dufourcq, "Le christianisme dans les pays de l'Occident musulman," p. 240; for further observations on the numbers of Mozarabs in the Peninsula see J. Pérez Fernández-Figares, "Los mozárabes en el norte de España," pp. 164-69 (his rather speculative views are in general agreement with B. Reilly's and strikingly opposed to those of Epalza *et al.*); see also R. Bulliet, *Conversion to Islam in the Medieval Period*, p. 124, and T. Glick, *Islamic and Christian Spain*, pp. 33-35, who both argue that in the eleventh century twenty per cent of the original Christian population must have remained unconverted.

²⁷ D. Wasserstein, *The Rise and Fall of the Party-Kings*, p. 229.

Seville, Cordoba, Mallorca, Malaga, Granada, and Toledo well into the twelfth century,²⁸ and the evidence suggests that these were, in some cases at least, “organized communities having at their disposal priests, bishops, (and) monks.”²⁹ In some cities such as Valencia these Christians lived in their own quarters but in others such as Seville, Cordoba and Toledo, they lived intermingled with Muslims and Jews in a residential *convivencia*.³⁰ Wherever and in whatever circumstances they lived, the Mozarabs were viewed by the Muslim rulers of al-Andalus as protected “peoples of the book,” having been granted *dhimmi* status at the time of the Arab conquest of Spain, gaining thereby the right to govern their own affairs to a large extent, in exchange for the payment of special taxes and the acceptance of Muslim rule.³¹

²⁸ See esp. V. Lagardère, “Communautés mozarabes et pouvoir almoravide,” *passim*; but also P. Guichard, “The Social History of Muslim Spain,” p. 688; on Toledo see, R. Pastor de Tognieri, “Problèmes d’assimilation d’une minorité. Les Mozarabes de Tolède,” p. 363, and *id.*, *Del Islam al Cristianismo*, p. 63; and in general see L. Torres Balbás, “Mozarabías y juderías de las ciudades hispanomusulmanes,” pp. 172-89, and F. Simonet, *Historia de los mozarabes de España*, pp. 647-65, and 733-81, though his conclusions must, after more than a century, be used with caution. The existence of Mozarabic communities in many areas is still disputed since the evidence is both scanty and partially misleading. See D. Wasserstein, *The Rise and Fall of the Party-Kings*, pp. 230-31, n. 23 in connection with Lisbon as well as C.-E. Dufourcq, “Les Mozarabes du XIIe siècle,” pp. 125-30; C. Picard, “Les Mozarabes dans l’Occident ibérique,” *passim*; and A. Losa, “Moçárabes em território português,” *passim*. In connection with eastern Spain see M. Barceló Torres, *Minorías islámicas en el país valenciano*, pp. 129-31; and M. de Epalza, “Los cristianos en las Baleares Musulmanes,” pp. 140-42 and *passim*; and M. de Epalza and E. Llobregat, “¿Hubo mozarabes en tierras valencianas?” *passim*. For a controversial view on the Mozarabs of Toledo see M. de Epalza and M. J. Rubiera, “Los cristianos toledanos bajo dominación musulmana,” *passim*. For attempts to locate Mozarabic communities in this period by archeological methods see M. Riu, “Poblados mozarabes de al-Andalus,” *passim*, and *id.*, “Marmuyas, sede de una población mozarabe,” *passim*; but see P. Guichard’s criticisms of Riu’s conclusions in his “Les Mozarabes de Valence et d’al-Andalus,” p. 21.

²⁹ V. Lagardère, “Communautés mozarabes et pouvoir almoravide,” p. 116.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 111, and R. Pastor de Tognieri, “Problèmes d’assimilation d’une minorité: Les Mozarabes de Tolède,” p. 363, and *id.*, *Del Islam al Cristianismo*, p. 63.

³¹ For an overview of this process and further bibliography see M. de Epalza, “Mozarabs: an Emblematic Christian Minority,” pp. 152-53.

But these circumstances began to change rapidly with the upheavals which rocked the peninsula from the late eleventh century on. The North African Almoravid dynasty which ruled much of al-Andalus from the 1090s to the late 1140s saw the Mozarabic population of al-Andalus as a potential Christian fifth column for the Northern Kings in the intensifying wars of Christian reconquest. Naturally the situation of the Mozarabs now became rather delicate. Many fled to the north, following in the footsteps of earlier Andalusī-Christian immigrants;³² and many who did not flee were deported by the Almoravids to North Africa where they would pose less of an internal threat.³³ Under the North-African Almohad dynasty which immediately succeeded the Almoravid rulers of al-Andalus, the situation was no less difficult and further emigrations occurred.³⁴

The result was that by the end of the twelfth century only a few Mozarabic communities remained in al-Andalus, notable among them a community in Murcia which existed until at least 1243.³⁵ The greater part of the Mozarabs had either immigrated to the north or been deported across the Straits of Gibraltar. When Jaume the Conqueror, the king of Aragon, annexed the previously Muslim-ruled Kingdom of Valencia in the thirteenth century there

³² For more on these immigrations and for further bibliography see D. Wasserstein, *The Rise and Fall of the Party-Kings*, pp. 227-29; and A. Cortabarría Beitia, "Les études mozarabes en Espagne," 30-36.

³³ Such deportations occurred in 1106, 1126, and 1138; see V. Lagardère, "Communautés mozarabes et pouvoir almoravide," p. 99, and C.-E. Dufourcq, "Le christianisme dans le pays de l'Occident musulman," p. 239 for bibliography.

³⁴ On these further migrations see the works cited in n. 32; at least one group of Mozarabs was deported in c. 1170 by Almohads as well, though this time as a military unit; see V. Lagardère, "Communautés mozarabes et pouvoir almoravide," p. 99; C.-E. Dufourcq, "Le christianisme dans le pays de l'Occident musulman," p. 239; F. Simonet, *Historia de los mozárabes de España*, p. 770. On the political and military history of the peninsula from the mid-eleventh to the mid-twelfth century see B. Reilly, *The Contest of Christian and Muslim Spain*, passim.

³⁵ V. Lagardère, "Communautés mozarabes et pouvoir almoravide," p. 103, C.-E. Dufourcq, "Le christianisme dans le pays de l'Occident musulman," p. 240, n. 21; cf. P. Guichard, "Les Mozarabes de Valence et d'al-Andalus," p. 21.

were no Mozarabs to be found there.³⁶ Unfortunately, we know virtually nothing about the intellectual life of the Mozarabs deported to North Africa since all the sources known to us originate, as far as can be ascertained, among the Mozarabs still residing in Spain.³⁷

Because of its large native Mozarabic population, presumably, the greater part of these emigrating Mozarabs found their way to newly conquered Christian Toledo and other cities of New Castile.³⁸ In some instances whole communities of Christians from the south moved to Toledo, church hierarchy and all, so that the ancient capital of Visigothic Spain became a refuge for absentee bishops. According to Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada, the bishops of Eciija, Medina Sidonia, Niebla, and probably Marchena and Málaga all lived in Toledo in the latter half of the twelfth century.³⁹ It is not surprising, therefore, that most of the religious-controversial works that form the basis of this study are linked in various ways with the city of Toledo. The anonymous *Letter of al-Qūṭī* was written in that city; the equally anonymous *Tathlith al-wahḍāniyah* was sent to its Muslim refuter from Toledo; the Mozarabic commentary on Robert of Ketton's translation of the Qur'ān was composed there.⁴⁰

The city of Toledo to which so many of the Mozarabs fled was itself a thriving and vigorously multicultural city in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Though at the beginning of the eleventh

³⁶ See R. Burns, "Muslims in the Thirteenth-Century Realms of Aragon," p. 77.

³⁷ But see V. Lagardère, "Communautés mozarabes et pouvoir almoravide," p. 114, F. Simonet, *Historia de los mozárabes de España*, pp. 751-53, C.-E. Dufourcq, "Le christianisme dans le pays de l'Occident musulman," p. 239, and H. Goussen, *Die christlich-arabische Literatur der Mozaraber*, pp. 12-13 on the deported bishop Miqā'il ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz who made a new copy of the Arabic Gospels in North Africa in 1137.

³⁸ Though some, for example, apparently immigrated to areas of the Crown of Aragon; see A. Cortabarría Beitia, "Les études mozarabes en Espagne," p. 34 for bibliography.

³⁹ R. González, "Las minorías étnico-religiosas en la edad media española," HIE 2/2:505; see also A. Cortabarría Beitia, "Les études mozarabes en Espagne," p. 33; F. Simonet, *Historia de los mozárabes de España*, pp. 763-65.

⁴⁰ This commentary will be discussed in some detail in the following chapter.

century the population of Christian Spain was one-sixth that of al-Andalus and formed a society far more primitive in every way than its Muslim counterpart, all this was rapidly changing. While the north would remain very rural throughout this period, the population of its major urban centers would increase fifty to one hundred per cent in the course of the eleventh century, and the amount of arable land under cultivation would likewise increase.⁴¹ Northern Spain, in short, was experiencing the same dramatic population growth, economic expansion, and urbanization that occurred elsewhere in Western Europe in this period.⁴² Toledo, one of the largest cities in the peninsula,⁴³ could scarcely avoid the impact of this change.

Added to these demographic changes were the social, economic, and political transformations which followed in the wake of Alfonso VI's conquest of Toledo in 1085. As soon as the city was in Christian hands, large numbers of Spaniards, predominantly but not exclusively Castilians, began settling in and around the ancient Spanish capital.⁴⁴ As elsewhere in Spain, these northern Spanish settlers were joined by similarly substantial numbers of Frenchmen, though many of the "Franks" mentioned in contemporary documents had such non-French names as Willemus de Stradfort and Roberto de Wales indicating their extra-Gallic origins.⁴⁵ These Franks, of whatever northern European origin, had their own quarter in Toledo, though they did not live exclusively there, and were treated as a distinct ethnic group alongside the Castilians, Jews, and Mozarabs.⁴⁶

⁴¹ See B. Reilly, *The Contest of Christian and Muslim Spain*, pp. 30-35.

⁴² For a useful overview of this much studied aspect of medieval history see N. Pounds, *An Economic History of Medieval Europe*, pp. 90-122; cf. D. Wasserstein, *The Rise and Fall of the Party-Kings*, p. 5.

⁴³ See P. Guichard, "The Social History of Muslim Spain," p. 700.

⁴⁴ J. González, *Repoblación de Castilla la Nueva* 2, p. 96.

⁴⁵ L. Suárez Fernández, *Historia de España*, p. 181; J. González, *Repoblación de Castilla la Nueva* 2, pp. 105, 115.

⁴⁶ J. González, *Repoblación de Castilla la Nueva* 2, p. 105; A. González-Palencia, *Los mozárabes de Toledo, Volumen preliminar*, pp. 140-42. For a good overview of the multi-ethnic society of Toledo in the three centuries after Alfonso VI's conquest of it, see R. González, "La sociedad toledana bajomedieval," *passim*. A recent collection of articles edited by L. Cardaillac, *Tolède, XIIe-XIIIe*, *passim*, covers much the same ground in an introductory fashion, but at

These last two groups made up the rest of the population of the city and its environs. The Jews had lived in Toledo under Islamic rule, though little is known about them,⁴⁷ and large numbers of Jews moved to Toledo after 1085 as the situation of Jews in al-Andalus likewise became tenuous under the rule of the Almoravids and Almohads. Like the French, they tended to live in their own quarter.⁴⁸ Mozarabs also had lived in Toledo before Alfonso's annexation of the ancient capital, and the Christian church and its hierarchy appear to have survived intact throughout Muslim domination of the city.⁴⁹ These Mozarabs native to Toledo were supplemented enormously, as we have seen, by the influx of immigrants from other regions during the course of the twelfth century. For several decades after the conquest of Toledo, therefore, the Mozarabs were the largest ethnic group in and around Toledo, and the most important economically. Many Mozarabs lived within the city and supported themselves as artisans and merchants, but the majority lived in the rural areas of the hinterland.⁵⁰

considerably greater length.

⁴⁷ P. León Tello, *Judios de Toledo* 1, p. 22.

⁴⁸ Y. Baer, *A History of the Jews in Christian Spain* 1, pp. 49-51; A. González-Palencia, *Los mozárabes de Toledo, Volumen preliminar*, pp. 142-44; León Tello, *Judios de Toledo* 1, p. 29; for a brief but valuable overview of the Jews of post-1085 Toledo see P. León Tello, "La judería, un air de réussite," *passim*.

⁴⁹ A. González-Palencia, *Los mozárabes de Toledo, Volumen preliminar*, p. 118; F. Simonet, *Historia de los mozárabes de España*, pp. 667-74; B. Reilly, *The Contest of Christian and Muslim Spain*, p. 20. This view has been challenged by M. de Epalza and M. J. Rubiera in their "Los cristianos toledanos bajo dominación musulmana," pp. 129-33 where they argue, in conformity with their views expressed elsewhere (see just below, nn. 61-62), that the original Mozarabic population of Toledo had disappeared by the tenth century. But see P. Guichard's criticisms of this general view in "Les Mozarabes de Valence et d'al-Andalus," p. 23.

⁵⁰ See R. Pastor de Togneri, "Problèmes d'assimilation d'une minorité. Les Mozarabes de Tolède," pp. 364-66, and *id.*, *Del Islam al Cristianismo*, pp. 100-102. In Alfonso VI's day the Mozarabic population of Toledo itself has been estimated at about 3000 persons (see J. González, "Los mozárabes toledanos," pp. 83-84) while at the end of the thirteenth century its population has been estimated to have been about four thousand out of approximately 25,000 persons; even two centuries after the conquest, therefore, the Mozarabs still were a very large minority of the population of the city (see R. González, "El arcedianio Jofre de Loaysa," pp. 134-40, and cf. J. Pérez Fernández-Figares, "Los mozárabes en el norte de España," pp. 168-69). On the disputed question of whether the

Though at one time it was thought that the Jewish and varied Christian populations of Toledo were supplemented by equally substantial numbers of Muslims, it is now agreed that very few Muslims continued to reside there under Christian rule.⁵¹

Each of these major ethnic groups—Castilians, Franks, Jews, and Mozarabs—had been offered privileges by Alfonso VI to encourage them to stay in the city and attract more settlers, and each group maintained a certain degree of autonomy.⁵² The Mozarabs, therefore, were allowed to continue worshipping according to the Visigothic rite, even though the rest of the Spanish Church was forced to adopt the Roman rite;⁵³ though a new line of French—rather than native Mozarabic bishops—dominated the Toledan church from 1085 until the thirteenth century, the Mozarabic clergy, trained in its own schools in both Arabic and Latin,⁵⁴ continued to exercise considerable influence both within the six especially designated Mozarabic parishes and beyond; while the newly settled Castilians were subject to Castilian customary law, the Mozarabs were allowed to continue using the Visigothic *Liber iudiciorum* to which they had been subject under Islamic rule.⁵⁵ Nevertheless, the relative political and

Mozarabs were actually a majority of the population in the early twelfth century, see J.-P. Molénat's valuable observations in his excellent article, "Quartiers et communautés à Tolède (XIIe-XVe siècles)," pp. 181-87.

⁵¹ J. González, *Repoblación de Castilla la Nueva* 2, pp. 127-29, 132, 137; A. González-Palencia, *Los mozárabes de Toledo, Volumen preliminar*, pp. 151-53; and R. Pastor de Togneri, "Problèmes d'assimilation d'une minorité. Les Mozarabes de Tolède," pp. 364-65, and id., *Del Islam al Cristianismo*, p. 97; J.-P. Molénat, "Quartiers et communautés à Tolède (XIIe-XVe siècles)," pp. 168-69.

⁵² On the provisions of this settlement see A. González-Palencia, *Los mozárabes de Toledo, Volumen preliminar*, pp. 117-53; and also R. Pastor de Togneri, "Problèmes d'assimilation d'une minorité. Les Mozarabes de Tolède," pp. 368-69.

⁵³ See R. González, "The Persistence of the Mozarabic Liturgy," *passim*, for a fine brief account of this phenomenon together with abundant bibliography.

⁵⁴ See K. Reinhardt, "Biblia y cultura en la época de la reconquista," p. 133; R. González, "Las minorías étnico-religiosas," in *HIE* 2/2, p. 508.

⁵⁵ See A. González-Palencia, *Los mozárabes de Toledo, Volumen preliminar*, pp. 120-21; J.-P. Molénat, "Quartiers et communautés à Tolède (XIIe-XVe siècles)," p. 181; and F. Hernández, "Language and Cultural Identity," p. 37 who gives further bibliography on this matter. Both Molénat (*ibid.*, pp. 182, 186-87) and Hernández (*ibid.*, p. 37) point out, however, that the

cultural autonomy enjoyed by each community did not in any way preclude a high degree of social and cultural interpenetration between them. Christians, for example, sometimes lived in the Jewish quarter,⁵⁶ and Jews occasionally represented convents in legal affairs.⁵⁷ Commerce naturally brought people of every ethnic origin into contact with each other. As a result, we soon find intermarrying among the various Christian communities, and to some extent between Christians and Muslims.⁵⁸ Surprisingly, the offspring of marriages between Mozarabs and other Christians were sometimes given Arabic names. This apparently happened in the case of one ‘Abd Allāh ibn Chelabert (*Jalabart* in Arabic), the son of a Frank identified in a document from 1095. This and other similar examples indicate that some Spaniards and Franks—or at least their children—also became Arabicized and entered thereby into the Mozarabic community to some extent.⁵⁹ The early thirteenth-century translator Marc of Toledo is perhaps the most famous example of this phenomenon. As the late Professor d’Alverny pointed out, this Toledan native, who rendered both the Qur’ān and certain works of Ibn Tūmart into Latin, “was not a Mozarab in the strict sense of the term,” since his father was from northern Castile and was “probably one of the numerous men who came from the North to the new capital of the realm after the

Liber iudiciorum (called the *Fuero Juzgo* after it had been translated into Castilian in the thirteenth century) eventually became the dominant law of the city by the 15th century, most non-Mozarabs having decided to submit to it.

⁵⁶ J. González, *Repoblación de Castilla la Nueva* 2, p. 123.

⁵⁷ A. González-Palencia, *Los mozárabes de Toledo, Volumen preliminar*, p. 143.

⁵⁸ A. González-Palencia, *Los mozárabes de Toledo, Volumen preliminar*, pp. 140, 153; J.-P. Molénat, “Les Mozarabes: un exemple d’intégration,” pp. 95-96.

⁵⁹ A. González-Palencia, *Los mozárabes de Toledo, Volumen preliminar*, p. 140; and id., *Los mozárabes de Toledo* 1, pp. 3-4, doc. #4; cf. F. Hernández, “Language and Cultural Identity,” pp. 37-38 where Franks who apply for Arabic charters to be drawn up are discussed; and J.-P. Molénat, “Les Mozarabes: un exemple d’intégration,” passim, esp. p. 96, and id. “Quartiers et communautés à Tolède (XIIe-XVe siècles),” pp. 180-81, who emphasizes that this ability to assimilate outsiders is a sign of the vitality of the Mozarabic community in this period.

Reconquest.” But having been born and raised in Toledo himself, Marc spoke both Arabic and Romance from infancy and later became a master translator.⁶⁰ Mikel de Epalza believes that such Arabicized European Christians, whom he calls “Neo-Mozarabs,” actually made up the majority of the Mozarabic community in this period.⁶¹

Furthermore, the new Christian domination of Toledo, combined with the daily interaction between Christian and non-Christian, brought about a certain number of conversions to Christianity. The *qāḍī* of Toledo at the time of the conquest in 1085 converted, as did a certain number of other Muslims thereafter. Such converted Muslims—whom Epalza and other scholars call “New Mozarabs”—together with converted Andalusī Jews, likewise augmented the Mozarabic community.⁶²

This evidence suggests that the boundaries of the Mozarabic community in and around Toledo were fairly porous in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. While most Mozarabs were from families which probably had been Christian for centuries, others were converted Andalusī Muslims or Jews, while still others were the children of mixed marriages. On the fringes of the community we must locate Spaniards and other Europeans who came to the frontier and learned Arabic and so also partook in the Mozarabic community. Toledo was, after all, one of the most important centers for the translation of Arabic science and philosophy into

⁶⁰ On Marc see M.-Th. d’Alverny and G. Vajda, “Marc de Tolède, traducteur,” *passim*, and M.-Th. d’Alverny, “Marc de Tolède,” *passim*, esp. p. 27.

⁶¹ See M. de Epalza, “La islamización de al-Andalus,” p. 174; cf. *id.* and M. J. Rubiera, “Los cristianos toledanos bajo dominación musulmana,” p. 132.

⁶² On converted Muslims see J. O’Callaghan, “The Mudejars of Castile and Portugal,” pp. 46-53; A. González-Palencia, *Los mozárabes de Toledo, Volumen preliminar*, p. 152; and M. de Epalza, “Mozarabs: an Emblematic Christian Minority,” p. 151. See also esp. M. Rubiera Mata, “Les premiers Mores convertis ou les prémices de la tolérance,” *passim*. In this article she argues that the number of Muslim conversions to Christianity was very large, but see the criticisms of this view by ‘Abd al-Jāliq al-Šaddādī in his review of L. Cardaillac, *Tolède, Xlle-Xllle in al-Qanṭara* 13 (1992):615-16. On the problem of conversion of Muslims in general in this period see H. Kassis, “Muslim Revival in Spain,” pp. 83-95. On converted Jews see the discussion of the author of *Taḥlīṭ al-waḥdānīyah* in the following chapter.

Latin, and such European Arabicists as the famous Gerard of Cremona lived long there.⁶³ What we know about the authorship of the collection of religious-controversial works which form the basis of this study reflects this porousness well. The *Letter of al-Qūṭ* was probably written in its original form by a Mozarabic priest, while *Taḥlīth al-waḥdānīyah* and Petrus Alphonsi's dialogue against the Muslims were the works of converted Andalusī Jews. The anonymous *Liber denudationis* purports to be the creation of a converted Muslim. The annotations in the margins of the first Latin translation of the Qur'ān were probably the work of two or more people, one of whom was a native Mozarab, but another of whom appears to have been a non-Arabic speaking Spaniard or Frank.⁶⁴

The permeable boundaries of this community in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, and the resulting variety of ethnic backgrounds represented within it, had the effect of intensifying the multi-lingual character of the Mozarabs so graphically illustrated by Michael Semeno's epitaph. If the defining feature of this community was knowledge of Arabic and an Andalusī cultural background, this basic cultural disposition of the community was enormously diversified and fructified by knowledge of other languages and familiarity with other cultures. While knowledge of both Romance and Latin had always been found among the Mozarabs, the intermingling of Mozarabs and northern-Spanish Christians in and around Toledo and the return of that area to Christian rule naturally stimulated powerfully the use of both.

An excellent index of this increased use of Romance and Latin can be found in the evolution of naming practices among Mozarabs living in and around newly-conquered Toledo. At the time of the conquest in 1085 Mozarabs, like Christians elsewhere in the Arab-Islamic world, had long since adopted typically Arabic

⁶³ See T. Glick, *Islamic and Christian Spain*, pp. 262-63; on the translation movement see C. Burnett, "The Translating Activity in Medieval Spain," *passim*, but especially R. Lemay, "Dans l'Espagne du XIIe siècle: Les traductions de l'Arabe au Latin," *passim*.

⁶⁴ The authorship of these annotations is discussed in detail in the following chapter.

names.⁶⁵ Some were names that indicated that their bearers were Christians, such as Mīqā'il (i. e. Michael) ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz, the name of a bishop deported to North Africa in 1126.⁶⁶ Others such as Yaḥyá Abū Zayd ibn Ḥārith, the name of a prominent Christian Toledan in the early twelfth century, were indistinguishable from Muslim names.⁶⁷ As González-Palencia has pointed out, furthermore, there was a tendency for Mozarabs to have dual names, one Arabic, one Romance or Latin: thus Ibn 'Abd al-Azīz al-Hamāmī, for example, was also known as Clemens filius Johannis.⁶⁸ But as the twelfth-century progressed, the frequency of completely Arabic names decreased and the use of mixed Romance/Arabic names and, later, thoroughly Romance names increased. The case of the illustrious family of Yaḥyá Abū Zayd ibn Ḥārith is instructive. His son was named 'Abd al-Raḥmān, though he was also known as Abū Zayd. One of 'Abd al-Raḥmān's sons was named Yaḥyá after his grandfather, and another son was named 'Abd al-Malik, but a third was called Petrus in Latin and Buṭrus in Arabic. Petrus/Buṭrus in turn had a son known as Juan, or its Arabic and Latin equivalents, Yaḥyá and Johannes, depending on the language of the document. Juan/Yaḥyá's son was likewise named Petrus/Buṭrus and he used the very Spanish surname of Juanes. This second Petrus/Buṭrus's sons were all given such typical Spanish names as Juan, Garcia, Gonzalbo, and Fernando, and some of them used the surname Petrez. From Yaḥyá Abū Zayd ibn Ḥārith at the beginning of the twelfth century, therefore, we arrive in the fifth generation at his distinguished descendant, the cardinal archbishop Gonzalbo Petrez (d. 1299) in the later thirteenth century.⁶⁹ A similar tale can be told about all Mozarabic families.⁷⁰

⁶⁵ See esp. H. Zayāt's interesting article, "al-Asmā' wa-al-kuná wa-al-alqāb al-Naṣrānīyah fī al-Islām," *passim*.

⁶⁶ See F. Simonet, *Historia de los mozárabes de España*, pp. 751-53; V. Lagardère, "Communautés mozarabes et pouvoir almoravide," p. 114; H. Gousen, *Die christlich-arabische Literatur der Mozaraber*, pp. 12-13.

⁶⁷ See "Linajes mozárabes de Toledo en los siglos XII y XIII," p. 23.

⁶⁸ A. González-Palencia, *Los mozárabes de Toledo, Volumen preliminar*, pp. 123-24.

⁶⁹ See "Linajes mozárabes de Toledo en los siglos XII y XIII," pp. 23-27.

⁷⁰ J. González, *Repoblación de Castilla la Nueva*, p. 87; and cf. P. Molénat, "Des Beni 'Abd al-Malik aux comtes d'Orgas: Le lignage de Gonzalo Ruiz de

This movement from Arabic names to mixed names to fully Romance names is the obvious corollary of the gradual increase in the use of Romance and Latin among the Mozarabs.⁷¹ This expansion of Latin-European culture into the Mozarabic milieu manifested itself in other ways as well. The native Visigothic rite was suppressed in all areas but Toledo in favor of the Roman rite introduced from beyond the Pyrenees; the native Visigothic minuscule script (the so-called *littera Toletana*) gradually gave way before the Carolingian minuscule imported from France.⁷² Though still heavily Arabic speaking and still thoroughly imbued with Andalusī culture, therefore, the Mozarabic community in and around Toledo was coming ever more under the influence of Northern Europe in the period from 1050 to 1200.

It is scarcely surprising, then, that Michael Semeno/Miqā'il ibn Samanuh's epitaph was embedded in Toledo's pavement, and that its inscription testified to bi-lingualism, bi-culturalism, and mild religious ambiguity within the community of its origin. The Mozarabs' twelfth-century characteristics and vicissitudes—their continued use of Arabic and renewed cultivation of Latin, their enduring familiarity with Islam, their immigration to the Christian north and integration into the newly dynamic society of Northern

Toledo," passim; and F. Hernández, "Language and Cultural Identity," pp. 42-43.

⁷¹ By the early fourteenth century—well after the period with which this book is concerned—the Mozarabs of Toledo had ceased to write in Arabic, and gave up speaking it sometime later in that century; on this see F. Hernández, "Language and Cultural Identity," passim, esp. pp. 35, 40-44.

⁷² The bibliography here is immense, but see F. Suárez Fernández, *Historia de España*, p. 181-82; and R. González, "Las minorías étnico-religiosas," HIE 2/2, pp. 506-08. On the suppression of the Visigothic liturgy and many related topics see the articles in B. Reilly, ed. *Santiago, Saint-Denis, and Saint Peter*, esp. T. Ruiz, "Burgos and the Council of 1080" (pp. 121-30), R. González, "The Persistence of the Mozarabic Liturgy in Toledo after A. D. 1080" (pp. 157-85), and J. O'Callaghan, "The Integration of Christian Spain into Europe: The Role of Alfonso VI of León-Castile" (pp. 101-30). On the importation of Carolingian minuscule, see Z. García Villada, *Paleografía española* (Barcelona, 1974), pp. 87-93; and A. Millares Carlo, *Tratado de paleografía española* 1 (Madrid, 1983), pp. 140-43, 179-87.

Spain, their gradual Europeanization—all in various ways account for these features of that intriguing memorial.

These same circumstances of the Mozarabic community, moreover, are doubtless also partly responsible for the remarkable increase of interest on their part in anti-Islamic polemic during this same 150 year period. Such tumultuous times, with the conversion of prominent Muslims, the expansion of Christian territory, the growth of Christian self-confidence, and the paradoxical desire of many Christian intellectuals to acquire the jewels of Arab learning, naturally would have spawned a keen interest in apologetic.⁷³ At any rate, it is primarily such religious-controversial works written by the Mozarabs that provide us with the means to examine the intellectual history of this community during this century and a half. This small corpus of treatises and fragments, however, presents a variety of preliminary problems that must be resolved before the larger questions which this study addresses can be asked or answered; and to those preliminary problems we now turn.

⁷³ It is striking to notice that we have no record of any kind of Mozarabic apologetic or polemical works in the whole period between the late ninth century and c. 1085 when Toledo was conquered (see the beginning of the following chapter).

CHAPTER TWO
THE SOURCES: MOZARABIC APOLOGETIC
AND ANTI-ISLAMIC POLEMIC, c. 1050-1200

The Christian population of al-Andalus had almost nothing to say about the religion of their Arab and Berber rulers in the first several decades after the Muslim conquest of the Peninsula in the early eighth century. What interested them instead were the remarkable military and political successes of their foreign conquerors. When Muslims are mentioned at all in the Latin chronicles of the eighth century, therefore, they are referred to in ethnic terms—as *arabes*, for example, or *sarraceni*—but not religious terms.¹

But as the Muslim hold on the Peninsula solidified and as Christians and Muslims learned each other's language, this initial indifference necessarily gave way to keen interest on the part of at least some Christians in the religion of their rulers. Just as had already happened in the east, therefore, Latin Christians living in al-Andalus soon began to compose religious apologetic and polemical works directed at Islam.² Felix of Urgel, one of those accused of embracing the adoptionist heresy in the eighth century, was probably the author of a now-lost work known as *Disputatio Felicis cum sarraceno* (*The Disputation of Felix with a Sarracen*) mentioned in one of Alcuin's letters to Charlemagne.³ Similarly a Cordoban abbot named Speraindeo composed a tract against the Muslims in the 820s or 830s of which only a paragraph has been preserved in a later work of Eulogius. In this fragment Speraindeo

¹ This initial lack of interest in Islam *per se* has been thoroughly discussed recently by K. Wolf in his "Christian Views of Islam," *passim*.

² Early Arab-Christian apologetic in the East will be discussed at slightly greater length in chapter three.

³ *Monumenta Germaniae historica, Epistolae Karolini aevi*, ed. E. Dümmler (Berlin, 1895) 2:284 (Alcuin's letter #172). See K. Wolf, "Christian Views of Islam," and D. Urvoy, "La pensée religieuse des mozarabes," p. 429

responds to the Muslim claim that in paradise “beautiful women will be given to us . . . prepared for our enjoyment.” This “is not paradise,” he answers in part, “but a whorehouse (*lupanar*).”⁴ Speraindeo also wrote a treatise in defense of the Trinity and Incarnation. Though not explicitly anti-Islamic, this treatise, and the letter of Paulus Alvarus which led the abbot to write it, very likely were inspired by the Islamic denial of precisely these two doctrines.⁵ Though probably written earlier, a brief Latin life of Muḥammad composed by someone with a fairly good knowledge of Islam was known to be circulating in Spain in the mid-ninth century as well, since Eulogius copied it into his own works.⁶ These ninth-century tracts, together with the more famous works of Eulogius and Paulus Alvarus which likewise, though less directly, dealt with Islam as a religion, provide abundant evidence of contemporary Spanish-Christian interest in, knowledge of, and desire to confront the religion of the Prophet.⁷

⁴ See Eulogius’ *Memoriale sanctorum* 1.7, in J. Gil, ed. *Corpus scriptorum Muzarabiorum* 2:375-76), and see K. Wolf, “Christian Views of Islam,” and F. Franke, “Die freiwilligen Märtyrer von Cordova,” pp. 48-49.

⁵ See “Epistola Albari Speraindeo Abbati directa” (letter #7), and “Epistola Speraindei Albaro directa” (letter #8) in J. Gil, ed., *Corpus scriptorum Muzarabiorum* 1:201-10. On the anti-Islamic preoccupation of this work see F. Simonet, *Historia de los mozárabes*, pp. 341-42, F. Franke, “Die freiwilligen Märtyrer von Cordova,” pp. 49-57, and R. Schwinges, *Kreuzzugsideologie und Toleranz*, pp. 87-88. See esp. Paulus’ assertion in his letter (*Corpus scriptorum muzarabiorum* 1:202) that the most wicked thing that these unnamed heretics claimed was that the Gospel supported their denial of the Trinity in Jo 20:17 and their denial of the Incarnation in Mt 24:36, verses that Muslim polemicists used for exactly these purposes. See M. Asín-Palacios, *Abenházam de Córdoba* 3:41-42, 77-78,

⁶ See Eulogius, *Liber apoleticus martyrum* 16 (*Corpus scriptorum muzarabiorum* 2:483-86). See K. Wolf, “Christian Views of Islam,” and for a transcription and translation see his “The Earliest Latin Lives of Muhammad,” pp. 89-101.

⁷ The bibliography on Eulogius and Paulus Alvarus and their role in the famous Cordoban martyr’s movement is immense. Their works together with those of the other Spanish Latin writers living under Islam in the early Middle Ages are published together in the two volumes of the *Corpus scriptorum Muzarabiorum*, ed. J. Gil, Madrid, 1973. The most thorough survey of these works is in E. Colbert, *The Martyrs of Córdoba*; but see also F. Franke, “Die freiwilligen Märtyrer von Cordova,” passim, R. C. Schwinges, *Kreuzzugsideologie und Toleranz*, pp. 85-92. See esp. K. Wolf, “Christian Views of Islam,” 21-33; id., *Christian Martyrs in Muslim Spain*, passim; and D. Millet-

Now these works written in Latin by authors who often had little knowledge of Arabic, and who generally rejected the assimilation of many of their correligionists to the Arabic milieu,⁸ eventually were followed by works written by fully Arabic-speaking Christians. Already in the late ninth century the translator Ḥaṣṣ ibn Albar al-Qūṭī, the first Christian Arabic writer we know of in the Peninsula,⁹ had written an apologetic work in Arabic. Portions of this work are preserved in the polemic against Christianity written by a thirteenth-century Andalusī Muslim known only as Imām al-Qurṭubī.¹⁰ This imām's work, which in various ways preserves so much of the evidence most vital to this study, quotes fragments of "one of the books" of Ḥaṣṣ ibn Albar in which Ḥaṣṣ answers various questions about the Christian faith.¹¹ Al-Qurṭubī also quotes fragments of a work of exactly the same nature which he refers to as *The Book of Fifty-seven Questions* (*Kitāb al-masā'il al-sab' wa-al-khamsīn*).¹² Though al-Qurṭubī does not identify them as such, Professor van Koningsveld has cogently argued that the book of Ḥaṣṣ ibn Albar and *The Book of Fifty-seven Questions* are probably the same work.¹³ Ḥaṣṣ apparently wrote this treatise on the model of earlier Oriental-Christian works of this kind such as the *Kitāb al-masā'il*

Gérard, *Chrétiens mozarabes et culture islamique*, passim.

⁸ A rather later Latin work which might be mentioned here is the tenth- or eleventh-century *Tultusceptrum de libro domni Metobii* which explains the origins of Islam; see K. Wolf, "Christian Views of Islam." On the opposition of such writers as Eulogius and Paulus Alvarus to Christian assimilation to the Arabic/Islamic milieu, see K. Wolf, "Christian Views of Islam," and D. Millet-Gérard, *Chrétiens mozarabes et culture islamique*, pp. 77-78.

⁹ See above chapter one, n. 5.

¹⁰ For more on this author see below in this chapter.

¹¹ al-Qurṭubī, p. 422. For the other quotations of this work see pp. 58, 424-25, 427, 430-31; cf. P. van Koningsveld, "La apología de al-Kindī," p. 125, n. 38.

¹² See al-Qurṭubī, pp. 61, 80-81, 128, 432-33. Devillard, who did not take into consideration the citations of this work which appear toward the end of al-Qurṭubī's treatise, considered it to be essentially a heresiological primer based largely on patristic sources. See P. Devillard, "Thèse sur al-Qurṭubī (introduction)," p. 34.

¹³ See P. van Koningsveld, "La literatura cristiano-árabe," p. 699.

wa-al-ajwibah (*The Book of Questions and Answers*) by the Nestorian ‘Ammār al-Baṣrī (d. c. 825).¹⁴

After the lifetime of Ḥaṣṣ ibn Albar, however, we lack any hard evidence of further apologetic or polemical works written by Arabic-speaking Christians in Spain until roughly two centuries later. Whether there was no interest in such works during the intervening period—which would seem unlikely, since the tenth century witnessed considerable literary activity on the part of Arabic-speaking Christians in Spain¹⁵—or whether such works have simply disappeared without a trace we cannot tell. But from the later eleventh century through the end of the twelfth, we do have evidence of an enduring tradition of Mozarabic religious apologetic and polemic which developed during, and was apparently sustained by, the variety of important changes which this community experienced in this period. At least one such work has been lost to us, however. The same Imām al-Qurṭubī mentioned an otherwise unknown treatise, attributed to one ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn GhṢN but “written by some of the Christian bishops” and sent by them to the Qādī Abū Marwān ‘Abd al-Malik ibn Maysarraḥ al-Yaḥṣubī (d. 1157).¹⁶ No manuscripts of this work are known to exist. Moreover, the abundant references to the views of Christian bishops on various topics in Aḥmad Ibn ‘Abd al-Ṣamad al-Khazraǧī’s *Maqāmi’ al-ṣulbān*, an important twelfth-century anti-Christian work which will be discussed further below, suggest that there may have been still other works of this kind which have likewise been lost to us.¹⁷

¹⁴ Ed. by M. Hayek in his *‘Ammār al-Baṣrī*, pp. 91-266 (Arabic), French summary, pp. 56-83.

¹⁵ Such as several important translations from Latin to Arabic such as Orosius’ *Historiae*, and original compositions such as Rabī’ ibn Zayd’s *Calendar of Cordoba*; see P. van Koningsveld, “La literatura cristiano-árabe,” pp. 700-703, Id., *The Latin-Arabic Glossary*, pp. 54-60, H. Goussen, *Die christlich-arabische Literatur der Mozaraber*, pp. 9-10, 18-19, and H. Daiber, “Orosius’ *Historiae adversus paganos* in arabischer Überlieferung,” *passim*.

¹⁶ al-Qurṭubī, p. 49 (P. Devillard, “Thèse sur al-Qurṭubī [translation],” p. 9, reads the mysterious GhṢN as ‘ṢN); cf. P. van Koningsveld, “La apología de al-Kindī,” pp. 122-24 where another contemporary reference to what is probably this same work is discussed.

¹⁷ See, e. g., al-Khazraǧī 87, 92, 112, pp. 112, 118, 139.

But if some of these eleventh- and twelfth-century works have disappeared over the centuries, a small but extremely valuable corpus of them has been preserved. Four complete or fragmentary Mozarabic apologetic and polemical treatises have survived to our day, together with a remarkable polemical Latin commentary on the first part of the Qur'ān. These five works, moreover, can be supplemented by occasional passages of other works which happen to shed light in one way or the other on how Mozarabs thought about and approached Islam.

Liber denudationis (alias Contrarietas alfolica)

The earliest of the surviving Mozarabic religious-controversial works from this period is also the longest: the anonymous treatise known as *Liber denudationis siue ostensionis aut patefaciens* (*The Book of Denuding or Exposing, or the Discloser*). This treatise, however, presents at the outset a number of serious difficulties. Not only must such questions as its date and authorship be dealt with, but even the question of the title must be settled. That the work is a medieval Latin translation of a lost Arabic original must likewise be reckoned with: does the Latin translation in the form it has come down to us reliably impart the contents of the Arabic original?

While most of these questions can be answered only after examining the contents of the work, the problem of the title can be addressed directly. Though *Liber denudationis* has not received an enormous amount of scholarly attention, it did figure prominently in Norman Daniel's *Islam and the West: The Making of an Image*. He and a few other scholars, including the cataloguer of the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris which contains the only known manuscript of the work, have referred to it by the peculiar title of *Contrarietas alfolica*.¹⁸ Quite apart from the thorny problem of

¹⁸ See *Bibliothèque Nationale. Catalogue général des manuscrits latins 5* (Paris, 1966): 339; cf. N. Daniel, *Islam and the West*, passim; M.-Th. d'Alverny; "Deux traductions," 125-127; Id., "Marc de Tolède," pp. 43-48; M.-Th. d'Alverny & G. Vajda, "Marc de Tolède, traducteur," pp. 124-32; and C. Lohr, "Ramon Llull, Liber Alquindi," pp. 154-58; I must include myself among this group as well: T. Burman, "The Influence of the *Apology of al-Kindī*," pp.

explaining exactly what this title might mean (*The Alfolic Opposition? The Mutual Contradiction of the Alfolica?*), the difficulty with it is that the Latin text itself quite clearly tells us that the title of the work is *Liber denudationis siue ostensionis aut patefaciens*,¹⁹ which is doubtless the Latin counterpart of some such Arabic title as (*Kitāb*) *al-tashrīf aw al-izhār aw al-kashshāf*. It was the manuscript's seventeenth-century annotator who entitled it *Contrarietas alfolica*, apparently because this striking phrase is used once in the text.²⁰ D'Alverny and others have quite rightly argued that *alfolica* here is a corruption of the Arabic *al-fuqahā'*, plural of *al-faqīh*, meaning "legist," or "jurisconsult." The phrase, therefore, as it is used in the text, would mean the "mutual contradiction of the (Muslim) jurisconsults."²¹ But there is nothing in the manuscript and no external evidence to suggest that this should be the title of the work. The seventeenth-century annotator who, as I argue below in part two, had no other manuscript of the work to hand while he commented on the text, adopted it as the title for reasons which cannot be ascertained, and later scholars have followed him. I would hesitate to depart from this practice were it not that the work has a much clearer and more useful title which ought to be employed.²²

197-228.

¹⁹ *Liber denudationis* 1.2.

²⁰ See *Liber denudationis* 1.2 ("et contrarietate *elfolicha*," = "and the contradiction of the *elfolicha*") and commentary.

²¹ M.-Th. d'Alverny, "Deux traductions," pp. 125-26, Id. "Marc de Tolède," p. 44; M.-Th. d'Alverny & G. Vajda, "Marc de Tolède, traducteur," p. 125; cf. C. Lohr, "Ramon Llull, Liber Alquindi," pp. 158. *Contrarietas* normally means something like "opposition," or "obstinacy," but the contexts of its use here (see previous note) and in another passage of *Liber denudationis* (2.3) clearly indicate that "contradiction" is the intended meaning.

²² It should be noted that the problem of the title is complicated still further by the fact that Ramon Llull, who knew and used the work in his own writings, referred to it simply as *Telif*, which is very likely his rendering of the Arabic *ta'lif* meaning simply "composition" or "compilation." *Telif* is probably, therefore, the first word of a longer Arabic title which disappeared in his Latin citation of it. See his *De fine* 2. 6, *Raimundi Lulli opera latina* 9, CCCM 35:283, ll. 1084-87; for Llull's use of *Liber denudationis* see C. Lohr, "Ramon Llull, Liber Alquindi," pp. 153-58, and T. Burman, "The Influence of the *Apology of al-Kindi*," passim.

The content of the work, which provides our only clues with which to resolve these several other difficulties, has been very briefly outlined by both d'Alverny and Lohr,²³ but a more thorough examination is needed here. The work is divided in the manuscript into twelve chapters, each of which has its own short chapter heading, and these chapter headings have been written in our manuscript by the same copyist who wrote the rest of the text. But it is almost certain that these divisions and chapter headings were added sometime after the work's translation into Latin because several of the divisions seem fairly arbitrary, some even doing violence to the text. For example, according to its title (*De peregrinatione et lapide nigro*) chapter eleven is about the Ḥajj and the Black Stone of the Ka'bah, but the last quarter of it, in which the Islamic prohibition of alcohol is discussed, has nothing to do with this topic at all.²⁴ The clearest example, however, occurs at the division between chapters eight and nine. Chapter eight ends with the author commenting that "Muḥammad knew nothing of his state and <the state> of all Muslims or of what would happen to him after death (8.7)." In the manuscript a sentence fragment follows—*dicentem nos creauimus caelum et terram*, and then the title for chapter nine appears. There is no way to construe this fragment as part of the previous sentence in chapter eight, but it does fit nicely in the syntax of the first sentence of chapter nine. Placing it together with the first four words of that chapter we have *Dicentem nos creauimus caelum et terram inducit autem Deum pluries*, meaning "Now many times he (Muḥammad) introduces God <into the Qur'ān> saying, 'We created heaven and earth (9.1).'"²⁵ Moreover, the sentence thus construed fits well within the context, for at the beginning of chapter nine the author is attempting to show that the Qur'ān contradicts itself when it says in some places that God created the heavens first and

²³ M.-Th. d'Alverny, "Deux traductions," p. 127; Id., "Marc de Tolède," pp. 44-46; Ch. Lohr, "Ramon Llull, Liber Alquindi," p. 157.

²⁴ *Liber denudationis* 11.1-8; section on prohibition of wine: 11.7-8.

²⁵ The *autem* occurring late in the sentence (rather than second, as the grammarians insist) should not concern us overly; the translators are not great stylists; they use *autem* in this way elsewhere as well; see *Liber denudationis* 4.2 ("est praecedentibus quibus autem fuerit intellectus").

then the earth while in other places the order is reversed. Here, therefore, the chapter title actually seems to break up a sentence. The fact that Petrus Alfonsi's dialogue on the Muslims is attached to *Liber denudationis* in the manuscript as chapter thirteen suggests that perhaps the divisions were made by the copyist when the manuscript was compiled, but there is no way to be certain.²⁶

Though they probably are not part of the original work, the chapter titles are, nevertheless, useful in dividing up the text since they generally do reflect natural divisions in the argument. I have, therefore, maintained them in my edition and will refer to them for practicality's sake throughout.

Chapter one is strictly introductory, beginning with a Christianized (and of course Latinized) version of the *Basmalah*: "In the name of the Father . . . and of the Son . . . and of the Holy Spirit." In the manner typical of Arabic works, the author then praises God for His gifts and grace toward himself and asks that He lend His aid to the writing of the treatise to follow (1.1). The author then explains that he came to write his apology when he had converted to Christianity after living "in blindness and stupidity" in Islam, and asks God to make the reader understand this book which he calls <*Liber*> *denudationis siue ostensionis aut patefaciens*. He will attempt therein to make clear "the infidelity and error of those who oppose us." All this he will do by arguing on the basis of the Qur'ān itself and the Ḥadīth (1.2).

Chapter two discusses the foolishness of those who adhere to the law of Muḥammad, these adherents being divided by the author into four categories: those compelled by the sword; those duped by the devil; those who are children of earlier believers and who recognize that Muḥammad is not a prophet, but adhere to Islam because it is at least better than paganism; and those who choose it because of the laxity of behavior and looseness of morals condoned by the Prophet (2.1). The author then notes, citing the first of the many ḥadīths included in the work, that Muḥammad himself said that his people would divide into seventy-three groups after him, of whom only one group would be saved. Nevertheless,

²⁶ For more on this and related issues see the introduction to my edition of *Liber denudationis* below in part two.

every Muslim, the author asserts, considers himself to be part of the one saved group (2.2). Changing topic suddenly, the author then observes that Muḥammad gave his followers “the Qur’ān which contradicts itself,” adding that even its many commentators contradict each other regarding its meaning (2.3).

Chapter three is a defense of the integrity of the Christian scriptures against the Islamic accusation that Christians and Jews have corrupted them. The author first insists that Muḥammad’s mission was not attested by either of the Testaments or any miracles. Christ’s coming was proclaimed by all the prophets before him; Muḥammad’s mission was not (3.1). Muslims, moreover, cannot claim that references to him have been effaced by Christians since the Qur’ān itself, in such verses as 10:94, 5:42-43, and 15:9, demonstrates that the Bible was uncorrupted in Muḥammad’s time (3.2-4). Moreover, Jews and Christians who are dispersed throughout the world could not have falsified their scriptures in such a uniform way. If Holy Scripture does mention Muḥammad, it does so only when it describes false prophets (3.5).

Since neither miracles nor prophets testify to Muḥammad, the author argues in chapter four, his only alternative was to raise the sword, forcing people to follow, and to concoct false visions, duping them into the same. Here the author quotes two typical ḥadīths justifying the Jihād (4.1), and then recounts several further traditions which demonstrate that the Prophet worked no miracles (4.2). He then narrates several false accounts of the conversion of famous Muslims (‘Umar, for example) under duress (4.3), and recounts further traditions which describe Muḥammad receiving revelations in ways that seem to indicate the falsity of the whole enterprise—Muḥammad breaking out in a sweat and falling on his face in convulsion, for example (4.4-5). Yet we are to believe, the author observes sarcastically, that this man, who could not endure a visitation from Gabriel without having an epileptic attack, nevertheless was transported without any such physical reaction into heaven on his famous Night Journey (4.6-7).

Chapter five is a brief account of Muḥammad’s education based loosely on passages of Ibn Ishāq’s *Ṣīrah* of the Prophet and other works. The author describes Muḥammad’s association with the

heretical monk Baḥīrā (*Boheira*) and the two Jewish rabbis often mentioned in this context, and cites a ḥadīth which seems to demonstrate that they instructed the Prophet (5.1-2).

In chapter six the author describes how the Qur'ān was put together after Muḥammad's death by his followers, who disagreed widely among themselves regarding its contents. Here the author mentions the seven early Muslims who were said to have possessed the seven accepted readings of the Qur'ān, and quotes the ḥadīth which was used to justify the existence of these several readings (6.1-2). The author asserts that although there were great variations in their versions of the Qur'ān, Abū Bakr had one version preserved and burned the others, even though large portions of some sūrah were thereby omitted (6.3). Moreover, the Prophet himself (in verse 3:7) said that he did not understand the Qur'ān, which of course makes sense, the author remarks, since it is full of obscurity and fatuity (6.4).

The Qur'ān also contains many unseemly things, the author argues in chapter seven, here citing several well-known Qur'ānic passages and commentaries on them: the jealousy of Muḥammad's wives arising out of his love for his servant Māriyah the Copt (7.1-2, 7.5, 7.8); the Prophet's repudiation of his wife Sawdah bint Zam'ah referred to in verses 33:50-52 and the commentaries thereto (7.7); his infatuation with Zaynab the wife of Zayd, who repudiated Zaynab so that Muḥammad could marry her (7.9-10). The marriage practices of Islam so shocking to medieval Christendom likewise receive considerable attention (7.11), and the almost blasphemous (to Medieval Christian eyes) Qur'ānic mixture of Biblical prophets such as Lot and Job together with non-Biblical ones such as Sāliḥ and Hūd is described (7.13). Interspersed among these topics is more material of the same kind.

Chapter eight is a refutation of the Islamic belief in the miraculous nature of the Qur'ān and the universality of Muḥammad's mission. The author first points out that the Qur'ān is laden with material borrowed from the Bible and is laced with offensive tales (8.1), and contends further that the Arabic itself of the Qur'ān is defective as well (8.2-3). Moreover, if Muḥammad were a prophet sent to all nations, why did he speak only one language? The truly universal missionaries were Christ's disciples to

whom the Holy Spirit gave the ability to speak all languages (8.4-6). Muḥammad, in fact, did not even know what was to become of himself, the author notes; how therefore could he be considered a prophet (8.7)?

Chapter nine is the longest, dullest, and most petty of the whole tract, its twenty-five paragraphs describing the internal contradictions of the Qur'ān with a view to undermining its credibility. The author begins by noting that in some passages God is said to have created heaven first and then earth, while in other passages this order is reversed (9.1-2). In a similar fashion he attempts to demonstrate that the Qur'ān's statements about *inter alia* the day of judgement (9.3, 9.23), God's omniscience (9.4), paradise (9.6, 9.18, 9.20-21), and Satan (9.7, 9.10) are somehow inconsistent or merely foolish from the Christian point of view. Nevertheless, in the middle of this lengthy, literalist exercise there is one markedly interesting passage in which the author refutes the Islamic belief, based on verse 54:1, that Muḥammad caused the moon to split one night and fall on a mountain near Mecca. In addition to relying on the Ḥadīth and Qur'ānic commentaries here, as he does so frequently elsewhere, the author argues against the possibility of this miracle on the basis of Aristotelian physics and contemporaneous scientific principles (9.11-16).

After exposing what he believes are the Qur'ān's internal contradictions, the author then, in chapter ten, contrasts the Qur'ānic portrayals of Muḥammad and Christ in order to demonstrate through this evidence that Christ is the Son of God. Muḥammad spent his first forty years as a sinful idolator while Christ is referred to in the Qur'ān as the Word and Spirit of God (10.2-4). Christ is the heir of God's promise to Abraham while Ishmael, father of the Arabs, was excluded from this heritage. Muḥammad's parents were idolators; Christ was born of a virgin. Christ healed the sick and the blind, while Muḥammad worked no miracles at all (10.5-7). After this point by point contrast, the author then attempts to demonstrate Christ's divinity by means of a Christian interpretation of verse 4:171: "<Jesus> is the word of God which he infuses into Mary, and a spirit from Him (10.8)." In this passage (10.8-13) our author relies heavily on an Oriental Arab-Christian writer, as I will show in the next chapter.

By means of this argument he is able to conclude, on the basis of *Qur'ānic* evidence, that Jesus was the *verus filius Dei* (10.13). Attached to chapter ten are two short appendices in which he refutes two common Islamic objections to the Incarnation: how could God, whom heaven and earth cannot contain, become incarnate in the womb of a woman (10.14-17)? and how could God deserve to be crucified and ridiculed on the cross (10.18-22)?²⁷

Chapter eleven consists of a string of legends about the building of the Ka'bah, and the origin of its Black Stone, together with a brief account of what the author says was his own experience on the Ḥajj, or pilgrimage to Mecca. Here he relies in part on Ḥadīth material, in part on sources of unknown origin (11.1-6). After thus showing the Ḥajj in an unfavorable light, the author suddenly changes course and attacks the Islamic prohibition of wine, here relying on Qur'ān and Ḥadīth (11.7-8).

The twelfth and final chapter is a retelling of Muḥammad's famous Night Journey based on what is surely an authentic Islamic account similar, for example, to that of the twelfth-century Andalusī Muslim Qāḍī 'Iyāḍ (12.1-6).²⁸ Most of *Liber denudationis*' account of this event is also reproduced, almost verbatim, in Riccoldo da Monte di Croce's *Contra legem Saracenorum*.²⁹ Though he does not submit this miracle to any systematic criticism, the author of *Liber denudationis* intended for this narrative to appear shocking and ridiculous *per se* to a Christian audience. At the close of the work the author reiterates his assertion that Muḥammad worked no miracles and only convinced the greater part of his followers to adhere to his religion through force (12.7-9).

There is little doubt that the first ten chapters of *Liber denudationis* are all one work by one author, for chapter ten, in

²⁷ The ninth century Syrian Christian 'Ammār al-Baṣrī responded to the first of these objections in his *Kitāb al-masā'il wa-al-ajwibah* 4. 11, p. 194 [Arabic]; and mentions an objection very like the second in his *Kitāb al-burhān* 8, p. 79 [Arabic].

²⁸ See Qāḍī 'Iyāḍ, *al-Shifā'* 1. 3. 2; 1, pp. 231-35.

²⁹ For more on Riccoldo's use of *Liber denudationis* see the introduction to my edition of *Liber denudationis* below in part two.

addition to covering the points outlined above, also quite clearly is meant to sum up many of the points made earlier in the work.³⁰ But the two appendices to chapter ten and the last two chapters (eleven and twelve) of the work appear in some ways to have been arbitrarily added to the first ten chapters; and since most of chapter twelve is found in Riccoldo's *Contra legem Sarracenorum*, it may have circulated separately. Despite these facts, however, there is good reason to assume that all twelve chapters are probably the work of one author. Both chapters eleven and twelve contain abundant references to the Ḥadīth and other traditional Islamic material, just as the earlier chapters do. The beginning of chapter twelve, with its annotated quotation of verse 17:1 together with language suggestive of an exegetical source ("The explanation of these verses . . ." [12.2]), is particularly similar in structure to many passages in earlier parts of the work.³¹ The end of the same chapter, with its reiteration of one of the work's important earlier themes—that the Qur'ān itself indicates that Muḥammad worked no miracles and this in itself is proof that he was not a prophet (12.9)—is further evidence that it was written by the author of the earlier chapters. Both the sources and the central thrust of the last two chapters, therefore, are the same as those of the first ten sections of the work.

The sources of *Liber denudationis* are almost completely Arabic. It contains some seventy-five explicit citations of the Qur'ān, and in almost all of these cases the sūrah is specified by name. At least thirty separate ḥadīths are cited, sometimes with the *isnād*, or chain of authorities testifying to their validity, attached.³² Because the many Ḥadīth collections and Qur'ānic commentaries often repeat slightly different versions of the same ḥadīths, it has not been possible to establish exactly which collections and commentaries the author used. Nevertheless, as I will make clear in chapter four, most of these ḥadīths can be traced to one or several of the main collections, while others can be found

³⁰ See 10.5-7 and commentary thereto.

³¹ The use of Qur'ānic commentaries by the author of *Liber denudationis* will be discussed in detail in chapter four below.

³² This will be discussed in more detail in chapter four below.

in the main Qur'ānic commentaries. It is clear, moreover, that the author used both kinds of source, since some ḥadīths are cited in isolation from Qur'ānic verses (as they usually are in the Ḥadīth collections), while others are cited in order to give the traditional explanation of verses of the Qur'ān, just as they are in the commentaries. Furthermore it is likely that the author took some of this traditional material from early Islamic historical and biographical works such as those of al-Ṭabarī and Ibn Ishāq.³³ The only other sources used by the author are the Bible (available by this time in Arabic), the Oriental Arab Christian mentioned above,³⁴ and perhaps Aristotle (9.15) and a letter of Pseudo-Dionysius (9.12), these last two appearing only briefly. These works also would have been available to the author in Arabic.³⁵ Part of section 10.12 may be based on a specifically Latin source originating in the school of Laon, but this is far from certain.³⁶

Although *Liber denudationis* is anonymous, what we know about the circulation of the work together with certain features of its contents indicate that it was surely written in the western lands of Islam and almost certainly within the Mozarabic community.³⁷ First of all, it was doubtless translated somewhere in southern Italy, Sicily, or Spain since those were the areas where Arabic works were most commonly translated into Latin.³⁸ Moreover, Ramon Lull (1232-1316) and Ramon Martí (d. c. 1285)—Spaniards both—read this treatise during the second half of the thirteenth century. Though it is not clear whether Lull read it in

³³ See chapter four below.

³⁴ And discussed at some length in the next chapter.

³⁵ Graf notes that at least some of Pseudo-Dionysius' works were translated into Arabic in the Middle Ages; see G. Graf, *Geschichte der christlichen arabischen Literatur* 1, pp. 370-71.

³⁶ See commentary to *Liber denudationis* 10.12.

³⁷ See here also M. Th. d'Alverny, "La connaissance," p. 592, Id., "Deux traductions," p. 126; Id., "Marc de Tolède," pp. 43-47; and C. Lohr, "Ramon Lull, Liber Al-Kindi," pp. 157-58.

³⁸ D. Lindberg, "The Transmission of Greek and Arabic Learning," pp. 58-67. The Crusader states, the other important Latin enclave bordering on the Islamic world, may be ruled out as a place of translation since, as Joshua Prawer has pointed out, interest in such endeavors never developed in Outremer; see his *The Crusaders' Kingdom*, pp. 529-30.

Arabic or Latin, he fairly clearly was familiar with it by at least 1299.³⁹ Martí knew the work as early as 1256 or 1257 when he wrote his *Explanatio simboli apostolorum*.⁴⁰ Both this work and his *Quadruplex reprobatio*⁴¹ (whose dating is unclear) show the influence of the *Liber denudationis*,⁴² and the *Explanatio simboli* does so in a way which strongly suggests that Martí knew the original Arabic version rather than the Latin translation. Among the passages of that work which point to this conclusion is Martí's refutation of the Muslim claim that Christians and Jews corrupted the original revelations of God to Moses and Jesus by changing words and adding heretical ideas.⁴³ Here Martí quotes several passages from the third chapter of *Liber denudationis*. But his versions of these passages, while they contain exactly the same content as the corresponding sections of *Liber denudationis*, are couched in rather different language. Compare the following passages from the two works:

Liber denudationis 3.4:

Sicut dicit in Alchorano in Capitulo *Elhagar* quod interpretatur "Lapis:" *Nos* inquit in persona Dei, *descendere fecimus recordationem Dei et nos eandem custodiemus*. Lex et Euangelium apud eos dicuntur *recordatio*.⁴⁴

Explanatio simboli apostolorum, prologue:

³⁹ See my "The Influence of the *Apology of al-Kindī*," passim, and cf. the commentary to *Liber denudationis* 4.3; and cf. A. Bonner's review of my article in *Studia Lulliana (olim Estudios Lullianos)* 32 (1992):88 where he shows that Lull must have known this work as early as 1299, while I had argued that he first became familiar with it in 1305.

⁴⁰ See J. M. March "En Ramón Martí y la seva 'Explanatio simboli apostolorum,'" p. 447; and A. Berthier, "Un Maître orientaliste du XIIIe siècle," pp. 279-81.

⁴¹ For more on this work and its attribution to Martí, and for more on Martí himself, see chapter six below.

⁴² See below, chapter six.

⁴³ For more on this oft-used Muslim polemical strategy see chapter three below.

⁴⁴ Translation: *Just as he says in the Qur'ān in the Chapter of Elhagar, which is translated "the Stone."* We, he says impersonating God, made the remembrance of God descend, and we will protect the same. *The Law and the Gospel are among them called the remembrance.*

Item, in cap. *Hygr*, introducit Deum sibi loquentem. *Nos demisimus memoriale et sumus eius custodes*. Vocat autem legem et Evangelium memoriale Dei, ut dicunt Sarraceni.⁴⁵

The two passages are obviously remarkably similar. Both quote the same Qur'ānic verse (15:9) for the same purpose (to demonstrate the validity of the Judeo-Christian scriptures); both passages observe, rather snidely, that the words of the verse as they appear in the Qur'ān are placed by Muḥammad directly in the mouth of God; and both verses include the same explanation of the word "remembrance" (Latin *recordatio*, *memoriale*; *dhikr* in the Qur'ān). It is hard not to conclude, especially in light of the other striking parallels between the two works,⁴⁶ that Martí had a copy of *Liber denudationis* open next to him as he wrote. Yet the actual Latin wording of the passages differs so much that we must either assume that Martí systematically reworked the Latin version of this treatise, a procedure that seems unlikely (why go to the trouble of changing *recordatio* to *memoriale*, or *nos eandem custodiemus* to *sumus eius custodes* when both sets of formulations seem equally [mis]understandable?), or that Martí was simply translating the original Arabic version of the same passage into Latin himself.

This latter, more plausible theory is supported, oddly enough, by the one significant difference between the two passages. In *Liber denudationis*, Sūrah fifteen is called *Elhagar* which the translators say means "the Stone;" Martí's version says that the sūrah's name is *Hygr*. The actual Arabic name is *al-Ḥijr*, which is the proper name of a region between the Hijaz and Syria. The translators of *Liber denudationis* misread this in their undoubtedly unvocalized Arabic manuscript as *al-ḥajar*, which does indeed mean "the stone," while Martí (fine Arabist that he was) recog-

⁴⁵ Translation: "Likewise, in the Chapter of *Hygr* he introduces God speaking to himself: We sent down the remembrance and we are the guardian of it. Now he calls the Law and the Gospel the remembrance of God, as the Muslims say." Martí, *Explanatio simboli*, prologue, p. 454, ll. 39-40. The editor of the work, J. M. March, read *demissus* where I have read *demisimus*, the latter form being justified not only on the basis of sense, but also as a perfectly suitable translation of the Arabic verb *arsalnā* of the Qur'ānic verse in question (cf. *Glossarium*, p. 319 where *mitto* and *emitto* are defined as, *inter alia*, *arsila*).

⁴⁶ Which will be discussed later in this chapter.

nized the proper form and preserved it in transliteration. While it is possible that Martí could have corrected the Latin text of *Liber denudationis*, restoring the name to its proper form and dropping from the quotation the translators' incorrect explanation, the simplest explanation is that he was working directly from the Arabic text itself.

In any case, *Liber denudationis* was circulating in Spain, probably in both the Arabic and Latin versions, in the second half of the thirteenth century.⁴⁷ Moreover, at about the same time as Lull became familiar with the work, Martí's younger confrere, Riccoldo da Monte di Croce (d. early fourteenth century), likewise had read the work in Latin, presumably in Italy, and its influence is apparent in his two famous treatises, *Contra legem saracenorum* and *Itinerarium*.⁴⁸

But in addition to being translated somewhere on the Latin frontiers of the western Islamic world, and possibly in Spain, and in addition to having circulated in Spain and Italy in the second half of the thirteenth centuries, certain features of the work's contents also point to a western (and almost certainly Iberian) origin. In the first place, the author is conscious of being in the West. He refers to the Iraqī Dāwūd al-Iṣfahānī, founder of the Zāhirite *madhhab*, as "David the Oriental" (*David Orientalis*, 2.3), and to the Iraqī Abū Ḥanīfah as *Eba Honeife theologus orientis* (11.8). Moreover, he argues that the Qur'ān mistakenly says that Christians and Jews call their religious leaders "lords" (verse 9:31) "since in the *Orient* they used to call priests and monks *rabbān* [=the Arabic *rabbān*]," a word similar to the word for "lord"

⁴⁷ The author of an anonymous life of Muḥammad in thirteenth-century Spain may also have been influenced by *Liber denudationis*. See anonymous, "Vita Mahometi," p. 395 ("Et volumus enarrare vobis ea que ipse dixit de Xpo, dicens ipsum esse Spiritum Dei et eiusdem Verbum. Et dixit de beata Maria quod Deus misit ad eam angelum suum Gabrielem, et concepit de Spirito Sancto, Virgo in partu et ante partum et post partum, Virgo permanens et intemerata; et dixit etiam apostolos esse amicos Dei et fideles.") and cf. *Liber denudationis* 10.4, 10.13, 10.21.

⁴⁸ See J.-M. Mérigoux, "L'ouvrage d'un frère prêcheur," pp. 31-32 on the former and M.-Th. d'Alverny, "Marc de Tolède," p. 48 on the latter, and see also the introduction to my edition of *Liber denudationis*.

in Arabic (9.8).⁴⁹ Only an author living somewhere in or near the western Islamic lands would say such things.

Southern Italy or Sicily, however, can probably be eliminated as possible origins of the work because, although there were a certain number of Christian converts from Islam in these areas⁵⁰ (and the author of this work claims to be such a convert), the familiarity of the author of *Liber denudationis* with the Arab-Christian apologetic and polemical tradition presupposes his having lived within a fairly large Arabic-speaking Christian community such as could be found only in al-Andalus and North Africa.⁵¹

Furthermore, the fact that Dāwūd al-Iṣṣfahānī is mentioned at all, and especially the fact that the author perversely deems him the greatest of the commentators on the Qur'ān (2.3), suggests that the author was more likely from al-Andalus than North Africa because, as is well known, Dāwūd's *madhhab* flourished particularly in al-Andalus, principally because of the weighty influence of Ibn Ḥazm of Cordoba who was certainly Dāwūd's most important follower.⁵² Moreover, the efflorescence of Zāhirite ideas in al-Andalus occurred at roughly the time when the *Liber denudationis* was probably written,⁵³ that is (as I will argue presently) sometime between 1085 and 1132. Furthermore, assuming that Mohamed Talbi is correct in his estimation of contemporaneous North-African Christianity, then that Christian community was

⁴⁹ Oriental Christians, at least, did indeed address priests with the honorific term *rabbān*; see commentary to *Liber denudationis* 9.8.

⁵⁰ See D. Abulafia, "The End of Muslim Sicily," pp. 109-12, and B. Kedar, *Crusade and Mission*, 51-52.

⁵¹ See ch. one above, *passim*.

⁵² On his place in the Zāhirite school, see I. Goldziher's lengthy study, *The Zāhirs*, pp. 109-71; see esp. pp. 156-57 for a discussion of Ibn Ḥazm's immediate followers, most of whom were Andalusī.

⁵³ Asín outlines the careers of Ibn Ḥazm's immediate followers in M. Asín-Palacios, *Abenházam de Córdoba* 1:279-303. It should be pointed out, however, that D. Urvoy, on the basis of the evidence in the biographical collections, has argued that Zāhirism remained always a fringe phenomenon in a Spain dominated by Mālikism, though it enjoyed periodic renaissances; see his *Le monde des ulémas andalous*, pp. 132-33. Cf. also D. Urvoy, *Pensers d'al-Andalus*, p. 82.

suffering a devastating collapse at just the time when *Liber denudationis* was written.⁵⁴ It is difficult to see how such a vigorous and, in its own way, learned work as this could have been composed under such circumstances.

Finally, the fact that *Liber denudationis* attacks the credibility of the Prophet and his book so unremittingly suggests that the work was written somewhere in Iberia outside the jurisdiction of Islamic law; for much of the treatise could be easily construed as calumny against the Prophet and therefore punishable by death especially in Mālikī Spain.⁵⁵ It is remarkable how rare such attacks are in Arab-Christian polemics against Islam written within the *dār al-Islām*; with the exception of the *Apology of al-Kindī*—which was probably written under a pseudonym for this very reason⁵⁶—I know of no other work which so vigorously attacks Muḥammad and the Qurʾān. Much more common is the circum-spect approach of the contemporary Nestorian Bishop ʿIlīyā al-Naṣībī who, when asked by a wazir about his views on the Qurʾān's use of metaphoric language, begged not to be forced to answer this delicate question; or the charitable attitude of the Mozarab al-Qūṭī who insisted that the religion of Islam was built on sound ethical principles and its revelation would only be completed by acceptance of the Christian mysteries.⁵⁷ Thus Toledo after its conquest by the Christians, when it became the center of the Mozarab community, would seem the natural place for such a work as *Liber denudationis* to have been written.⁵⁸

⁵⁴ See M. Talbi, "Le Christianisme maghrébin," pp. 338, 343.

⁵⁵ See A. Turki, "Situation du 'tributaire' qui insulte l'Islam," pp. 61-64. It is worth noting that an extant *fatwā* indicates that in the tenth century a Christian in North Africa who insulted the Prophet was sentenced to death and the loss of his property unless he converted to Islam. See H. R. Idris, "Les tributaires en occident musulman médiéval," p. 175.

⁵⁶ See M. Hayek, *ʿAmmār al-Baṣrī*, p. 14.

⁵⁷ ʿIlīyā al-Naṣībī, "al-Majlis al-sādis," p. 373; al-Khazraǧī 4, pp. 33-34; in this charitable attitude al-Qūṭī may well be following the example of the striking statements of the Nestorian Catholicos Timothy who in his disputation (an account of which circulated in Spain) with the Caliph al-Mahdī gave high praise to Muḥammad and the Qurʾān; see ʿTīmāthāwus, *al-Muḥāwarah al-dīniyah* 2, pp. 373-74.

⁵⁸ M.-Th. d'Alverny came to essentially the same conclusion in her recent "Marc de Tolède," p. 47.

A chance comment within the text itself makes the problem of dating *Liber denudationis* considerably easier. At the end of chapter nine, the author observes that

Muḥammad is reported in verified accounts . . . to have said that before one hundred years had passed away nothing would be living on the surface of the earth, and there is no one among his followers who doubted that the resurrection would be at the end of one hundred years. But we are already in the fourth century from that time.⁵⁹

Assuming Muḥammad made this statement sometime during his prophetic career, that is, between 610 and 632, and that the author had a fairly clear idea of when this was,⁶⁰ it is necessary only to add 100 years to this period to arrive at the time when nothing was to be living on earth, that is, sometime between 710 and 732. Since, according to this statement, the work was written *within* the fourth century after that time, the earliest possible date would be 1010, if the author wrote at the beginning of that fourth century after, the latest, 1132, if he wrote at the end of it.⁶¹

Furthermore, three factors suggest that the *terminus a quo* of 1010 suggested by this internal evidence is rather early. First, that Dāwūd al-Iṣfahānī is cited as the greatest of the commentators on the Qurʾān suggests that the work was written during the heyday of Zāhirism in Spain, after Ibn Ḥazm's adoption, adaptation, and propagation of Dāwūd's doctrines. Ibn Ḥazm died in 1064, which would suggest that *Liber denudationis* was written several decades later than 1010. Second, if it is true that this treatise was written under Christian jurisdiction, then we would expect it to have been

⁵⁹ *Liber denudationis* 9.23; the first sentence here is the translation of a ḥadīth of which Ibn Ḥanbal records several slightly different versions, see Ibn Ḥanbal 1, p. 93, and 2, p. 121.

⁶⁰ Note that a contemporary Latin translation of a series of Islamic traditions makes quite clear that 620 years separated Christ and Muḥammad. See anonymous, *Fabulae Sarracenorum*, fol. 5vb; cf. J. Kritzeck, *Peter the Venerable and Islam*, p. 78.

⁶¹ It is possible, but not very likely given its position, that the phrase "from that time (*a tempore illo*)" refers to Muḥammad's life, this pushing the *terminus a quo* back to the early tenth century. But see M.-Th. d'Alverny & G. Vajda, "Marc de Tolède, traducteur," pp. 125-26, whose interpretation of this passage allows for this possibility, but whose dating of the work is, nevertheless, the same as mine.

written after the Christian conquest of Toledo in 1085 when the large Toledan Mozarabic community came under the rule of Alfonso VI. Therefore, while it is certain that the work was written sometime between 1010 and 1132, it is probable that it was written sometime after 1085.

The text of *Liber denudationis* tells us almost nothing explicit about its author other than that he claims to be a convert from Islam (1.2, cf. 11.6). Conversions from Islam to Christianity were certainly not unknown during the period when this treatise was written: as I mentioned earlier, the qādī of Toledo, for example, converted to Christianity in the immediate aftermath of its conquest in 1085.⁶² Such a man as he might well have written a work of this kind, for in the unstable aftermath of Alfonso's occupation of Toledo, there would have been ample motivation for a convert to write a polemical work against Islam. He would have wanted both to justify his own actions and perhaps attract other converts who might be encouraged by the tumultuous political situation of the Peninsula to throw in their lot with the Christians.

Nevertheless, Norman Daniel and Marie-Thérèse d'Alverny have, without going into the matter in any detail, discounted this claim as a literary artifice designed to give the work more authority;⁶³ and indeed there is a good—though not ultimately conclusive—case to be made for the author's insincerity about his religious past.⁶⁴ First of all knowledge of the Qur'ān and Ḥadīth was

⁶² On this and other possible Muslim conversions to Christianity in this period see chapter one above, esp. n. 62.

⁶³ N. Daniel, *Islam and the West*, pp. 6, 12; M.-Th. d'Alverny, "La connaissance," p. 591, n. 27; M.-Th. d'Alverny & G. Vajda, "Marc de Tolède, traducteur" p. 126; and M.-Th. d'Alverny, "Marc de Tolède," p. 47.

⁶⁴ Though I do not find Daniel's primary reason—that, "It is often difficult to imagine that a convert, however much he hated his old religion, could take just the line that the author of this work takes" (N. Daniel, *Islam and the West*, p. 12)—very convincing. It seems to me, on the contrary, that it is altogether possible that a convert should take a hostile and characteristically Christian approach to Islam. If nothing else, we have the example of 'Alī al-Ṭabarī who, as a Christian convert to Islam, in no way moderated his attack on the Church in his famous polemic against Christianity; see 'Alī al-Ṭabarī, *al-Radd 'alā al-naṣārā*, eds. I.-A. Khalifé and W. Kutsch in their "Ar-radd 'ala-n-Naṣārā de 'Alī al-Ṭabarī," *Mélanges de l'Université Saint Joseph* 36 (1959):115-48.

certainly not uncommon among non-Muslims in eleventh- and twelfth-century Spain. At least one member of the Christian team who annotated Robert of Ketton's first translation of the Qur'ān used Qur'ānic commentaries with apparent ease, while the Mozarabs described by Ibn Ḥazm as well as the author of *Tathlith al-waḥdāntiyah* were all able to use the Ḥadīth collections to some extent.⁶⁵ One might add, moreover, that in the next century Ramon Martí repeatedly used the collections of al-Bukhārī and Muslim, the *Strah* of Ibn Ishāq, and Qur'ānic commentaries in his anti-Islamic works, especially the *Quadruplex reprobatio*.⁶⁶ The extensive familiarity of *Liber denudationis*' author with these Islamic texts, therefore, is hardly proof of his having been a Muslim.

Furthermore, the author's knowledge of the Islamic thinkers whom he names in the work is not profound. Abū Ḥanīfah, Dāwūd al-Iṣfahānī, and al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī, for example, are referred to by name in the text, but there is no evidence at all that the author is deeply familiar with the role that each of these very different men played in the religious history of Islam.⁶⁷ The author is clearly aware that Dāwūd took an extremely literalist approach to the interpretation of the Qur'ān, but appears to believe that there was nothing unusual about his doctrines. Rather, he gives every indication, especially when he calls Dāwūd *maximus apud illos*,⁶⁸ that he is ignorant of the fact that Dāwūd's views were considered completely unacceptable by most Muslims, particularly Andalusī Mālikīs. In effect he has lumped these and many other Muslim thinkers together as if they all represented precisely the same mistaken views, citing them indifferently whenever the thoughts of one served his polemical purposes, rather as if someone only minimally familiar with the Christian tradition gathered together quotations from Tertullian, St. Bernard of Clairvaux,

⁶⁵ See chapter four below, *passim*.

⁶⁶ See *Quadruplex reprobatio*, *passim*, and A. Cortabarría, "Fuentes árabes del «Pugio fidei»,» p. 596; Martí, of course, had a wide knowledge of Islamic philosophy and religious thought as well, see Cortabarría, *ibid.*, pp. 581-96.

⁶⁷ See *Liber denudationis* 11.8, 2.3, 9.20.

⁶⁸ *Liber denudationis* 2.3.

Martin Luther, and Paul Tillich, and used them to illustrate the characteristically Christian view of things.

Moreover, as Norman Daniel pointed out, the author's account of his pilgrimage to Mecca "is particularly unconvincing."⁶⁹ First of all, the events he describes here are a distortion of the activities that take place during only one part of the Ḥajj, the gathering at al-Minā.⁷⁰ Secondly, there is nothing here that he could not have learned from the Ḥadīth anyway, since most of the activities of the pilgrimage are described there in detail. Therefore, this account in no way demonstrates that the author was a convert.

All this would suggest that, rather than being a converted Muslim, the author of *Liber denudationis* was a well-educated Mozarab⁷¹ who knew the basic Islamic religious texts well, and who had, as I will indicate in the next chapter, a good knowledge of the anti-Islamic literature in Arabic, but who did not know Latin with any proficiency.

Nevertheless, although there are several indications that *Liber denudationis*' author was only masquerading as a convert, the case is far from conclusive. Indeed, it is not impossible to imagine an Andalusī Muslim learned enough to read the Qur'ān, Ḥadīth, and Qur'ānic commentaries, but who remained rather hazy on other areas of Islamic religious history, and who, having never been on the Ḥajj, was unclear as to exactly what occurs at the holy places of Islam as well. Having converted, such a man as this could also very easily have been the author of *Liber denudationis*. As a result, while I tend to agree with Daniel and d'Alverny that the author's claim to be a convert may be an artifice, the real possibility that he was in fact a former Muslim cannot be discounted.

Finally, some comments need to be made about the Latin translation itself, for it is not immediately clear what its precise relationship is to the original, and now lost, Arabic version. The

⁶⁹ N. Daniel, *Islam and the West*, p. 12.

⁷⁰ *Liber denudationis* 11.6; and see commentary thereto.

⁷¹ There is some evidence that the author may actually have been a converted Jew. See *Liber denudationis* 9.24 and commentary thereto. As I indicate in the commentary, this evidence is ambiguous, for it is possible that the Hebrew words used here were inserted by the translators.

single, extant manuscript of the Latin version ends with the following ambiguous colophon:

I, by preserving the sense rather than the words, and by abbreviating many things, followed a translator who translated word for word.⁷²

This sentence could be interpreted to mean two rather different things. It could have been written at the time of the translation of the work into Latin and then recopied by later copyists including the sixteenth-century scribe of this particular manuscript. In this case the colophon would seem to be the description of a team translation of the sort that were very common in twelfth- and thirteenth-century Spain.⁷³ In such team efforts, a Jew or Mozarab translated from Arabic into Romance, the Romance in turn being translated into Latin by another translator, in this case the author of the colophon. Alternatively, as M.-Th. d'Alverny has argued,⁷⁴ this colophon could have been written by a later redactor and abbreviator of the original Latin translation; if this is so, then the version which we now have is actually an abridgement of that original Latin translation. Short of finding such a longer, literal Latin version of the work—and to my knowledge no evidence of such a version exists—there is no way to decide which of the two interpretations of this colophon is correct.

Both interpretations, however, undeniably suggest that the original contents of the work have been substantially abbreviated—at the point of translation from Arabic into Latin according to the first, or at some time after the translation according to the second.⁷⁵ We are unavoidably forced to consider, therefore, how accurately the version of the work which we possess today reflects the views and methods of the original Mozarabic author. Since the Arabic version has been lost, it would seem to

⁷² *Liber denudationis*, 12.9.

⁷³ See D. Lindberg, "The Transmission of Greek and Arabic Learning," 70.

⁷⁴ See her "Marc de Tolède," p. 47.

⁷⁵ They also both imply that the translation, as we have it, is the work of more than one hand. For the sake of convenience, therefore, I will refer throughout to "the translators" of the work in the plural rather than the singular, even though the original Arabic to Latin translation and the abridgement of it may well have happened at different times.

be impossible to answer this question. But we have more relevant evidence than we might imagine. First of all, Ramon Martí's *Explanatio simboli*, as I have already pointed out, appears to quote certain passages of the original Arabic of *Liber denudationis* in Martí's own Latin translation. These passages can be compared to the full Latin translation which has come down to us with a view to determining the extent to which *Liber denudationis* has been abbreviated. Second, the many passages of the extant Latin version of *Liber denudationis* which are quotations of the Qur'ān and Ḥadīth can be compared with the original Arabic of those works to the same end.

The impression gained in this way of the nature of the extant translation is that it is a rather literal, though occasionally sloppy, translation which shows some signs of abbreviation but almost no evidence of serious paraphrase. The strongest indication of abbreviation consists of a passage of Martí's *Explanatio simboli* which is probably another direct quotation of the Arabic version of *Liber denudationis*. Here, while defending the integrity of the Christian scriptures, Martí makes the following observation:

Item, in cap. *mense*, quando iudei postulaverunt iudicium ab Ebihoreyra, quem posuerat Machometus iudicem, ut iudicaret inter homines, et ille diceret eis: Non iudico inter vos, donec interrogem Machometum; et ille ivisset ad Machometum et interrogasset eum, respondit Machometus et dixit: Deus misit super me in facto iudeorum, et dixit: *Si venerint ad te, iudica inter eos, aut avertere ab eis, et si avertaris ab eis, non nocebunt tibi in aliquo. Et si iudicaveris inter eos, iudica iuste; quia Deus diligit iuste iudicantes. Et quomodo*⁷⁶ *veniunt ad iudicium tuum et apud eos est lex et in ipsa est iudicium Dei?* Et ecce hic testatus est Machometus, quia tempore suo lex erat apud iudeos, in qua erat iudicium Dei; unde ex hoc patet quod ramanserat incorrupta; quia, si corrupta fuisset, verum iudicium Dei non contineret.⁷⁷

⁷⁶ March reads *quando* here, but both the meaning and the text of the Qur'ān (*wa-kayfa*) suggest that *quomodo* is appropriate; in any case, the abbreviations of these two words in typical medieval Latin script are easily confused.

⁷⁷ Martí, *Explanatio simboli*, p. 454, ll. 30-38. Translation: "Likewise in the Chapter of the Table, when the Jews asked for judgement from Ebihoreyra whom Muḥammad had established as a judge in order that he might judge between men, and he said to them, 'I will not judge between you until I ask Muḥammad;' and [when] he had gone to Muḥammad and asked him, Muḥammad replied, 'God has sent upon me [a message] in regard to the act of the Jews, and He said: *If they come to you, judge between them, or turn away*

The same argument based on the same verse (5:42-43) and the same Islamic tradition connected with it can be found in *Liber denudationis*, but in a considerably abbreviated form:

Item cum dicat in Capitulo *Elmaiede*, id est “mensa,” quod iudex eius Ebazoheite dixit Machometo quando Iudei quaerebant iustitiam et iudicium ab eo, et respondit, *Si uenerint ad te, iudica inter eos iuste, quia Deus diligit iustitiam facientes. Et quomodo petent ipsi a te iustitiam, cum sit apud eos Uetus Testamentum in quo est Dei iustitia?* Igitur iuxta verbum Machometi non erat lex corrupta ante tempus eius, sed neque post.⁷⁸

As I show elsewhere, the story of the judge known here as Ebihoreyra/Ebazoheite⁷⁹ is based on the ḥadīths normally adduced to explain the occasion for the revelation of these verses, so it is possible that Martí was simply working from the same Qur’anic exegetical sources as the author of *Liber denudationis*.⁸⁰ Yet this passage from the *Explanatio simboli* is but a part of a longer section of that work which follows *Liber denudationis* in content uncannily closely.⁸¹ It seems more likely, therefore, that Martí records here a more complete version of what *Liber denudationis*

from them, and if you turn away from them, they will not harm you in anything. And if you judge between them, judge justly; for God loves those who judge justly. And how do they come to your judgement when [the Latin *et* literally, though awkwardly, translates the Arabic *waw* of accompanying circumstance used here in the Qur’ān] they have the Law and in it is the judgement of God (5:42-43)? And behold, here Muḥammad testified that in his time the Jews possessed the Law in which was the judgement of God. Whence, it is obvious from this that it had remained incorrupt, for if it had been corrupted, it would not have contained the judgment of God.” I have added the italics which mark off his quotation of vv. 5:42-43.

⁷⁸ *Liber denudationis* 3.3-4. Translation: “Likewise when he says in the Chapter of *Elmaiede*, that is “the Table,” that when the Jews were seeking justice and judgement from him, his judge Ebazoheite told Muḥammad, and he responded, *If they come to you, judge between them justly because God loves those who render justice. And how will they seek justice from you when they have the Old Testament in which the justice of God resides* (5:42-43)? Therefore according to the word of Muḥammad the <Biblical> law was corrupted neither before his time nor afterward.”

⁷⁹ On the identity of this person see commentary to *Liber denudationis* 3.3.

⁸⁰ See commentary to *Liber denudationis* 3.3.

⁸¹ See *Explanatio simboli*, p. 454, ll. 22-42, and cf. *Liber denudationis* 3.2-4.

said in the original Arabic than does the extant Latin translation of that work. This conclusion is also supported by the fact that Martí's version of the story of Ebibihoreyra/Ebazoheite, by explaining why this man was asked to render judgement and how he came to be in the position to do so, fills in the frustrating gaps in the shorter version of *Liber denudationis*. Moreover, in *Liber denudationis*' version the Qur'ānic verses are also cited in abbreviated form. The evidence, therefore, is strongly in favor of the view that this passage as it stands in the Latin translation of *Liber denudationis* is an abbreviated version of the original Arabic.

But notice that, while *Liber denudationis*' version of these events appears to be an abbreviation of what the original Arabic version said, it is nevertheless quite a literal rendering of those portions of the text that are translated. An analysis of the Latin translation of the abbreviated Qur'ānic verse makes this clear, for although a substantial portion of those verses has been left out, what remains is literally and carefully translated. The portion of the verses preserved in the extant Latin version of *Liber denudationis*—*Si uenerint ad te, iudica inter eos iuste, quia Deus diligit iustitiam facientes. Et quomodo petent ipsi a te iustitiam, cum sit apud eos Uetus Testamentum in quo est Dei iustitia*—is a word-for-word translation of two parts of these verses, with a large section left out between *ad te* (Arabic *-ka*) and *iudica inter* (Arabic *fa-uḥkum baynahum*): *Fa-in jā'ūka . . . fa-uḥkum baynahum bi-al-qisṭ. Inna Allāh yuḥibbu al-muqsiṭīn. Wa-kayfa yuḥakkimūnaka wa-'inda-hum al-Tawrāh ft-hā ḥukm Allāh.*

In short, this passage of Martí's *Explanatio simboli* provides strong evidence of some amount of abridgement of the original contents of the Arabic version of the *Liber denudationis* in the extant Latin translation; nevertheless, at least as far as the Qur'ānic verses themselves are concerned, this abridgement has not also involved radical paraphrase.

In general, a comparison of the Latin versions of the many other citations of the Qur'ān in *Liber denudationis* with the corresponding Qur'ānic Arabic yields similar results. Almost invariably the Latin follows the Arabic syntax and construction

quite closely. Sometimes we have almost completely verbatim translation, as in chapter nine, when the author cites verse 10:84, the Arabic version of which reads as follows: *Yāqawmi* (sic) *in kuntum āmantum bi-Allāh fa-ʿalayhi tawakkalū in kuntum muslimīn*. The translators rendered it in Latin in this way: *O popule, si uere credentes fueritis Deo, in ipso confidite si Sarraceni fueritis* (“O people, if you are believers in God, have faith in Him, if you are Muslims” [9.24]). Here the word order of the Latin matches the Arabic thoroughly; it is clear that the translators have endeavored to create a one-to-one correspondence between the Latin words and the Arabic words.⁸² They did not, for example, translate *kuntum āmantum* with *credideritis*, the perfect subjunctive (“you believed”) which would have been more natural in Latin, and would have communicated the meaning more economically, than the periphrastic *credentes fueritis*; adopting this latter alternative, however, allowed the translators to use one Latin word for each Arabic word.⁸³ A significant number of the Qur’ānic verses are translated in this literal manner—sometimes, as I have pointed out below in part two in some detail, to the point of confusion since the Latin syntax is often twisted to the breaking point to meet the needs of the Arabic.⁸⁴

In many other cases the translation, though not crudely literal, still follows the Arabic carefully, as in the citation of verse 7:11 in chapter nine: *Nos creauimus uos; postea formauimus uos, diximusque angelis: Adorate Adam* (“We created you; afterwards we formed you, and we said to the angels: Adore Adam” [9.7]), which translates *wa-la-qad khalaqnākum thumma ʿaẓawmānākum*

⁸² S. Brock has pointed out that such one-to-one correspondence was often a central concern of literalist translators. See his “Aspects of Translation Technique in Antiquity,” pp. 81-84.

⁸³ It should be noted that the Arabic perfect *kuntum* (in both its appearances in the sentence) should not actually have been translated by the Latin perfect *fueritis* here since in conditional sentences the Arabic perfect has no explicit temporal meaning. The beginning of the sentence, for example, really means “If you are believing in God . . .” or “If you are believers in God . . .” In this case, however, as in so many others, the Latin translators had difficulty in translating the tenses of the Arabic verbs into the very different Latin verbal system; see the introduction to the edition and translation of *Liber denudationis* below.

⁸⁴ See the introduction to my edition *Liber denudationis* in part two below.

thumma qulnā lil-malā'ikah usjudū li-ādam. Here the tenses of the verbs and the order of the ideas are the same; but the twice-repeated *thumma*, "and then", is rendered first with *postea* and then left out altogether with little damage done to the sense, though the resultant Latin version lacks the rhetorical effect of the Arabic. The majority of the Qur'ānic translations show this kind of faithfulness to the word order, with slight deviations for stylistic reasons or lack of attention.

Though typically it is not possible to tell when a verse has been abridged in some way, there are a few instances in which this seems to be the case. When the author cites verse 10:15 in chapter eight we have the following Latin: *Dicent qui non sperant inuentionem nostram: "muta Alchoranum." Dic: "et unde hoc mihi ut immutem eum per me ipsum"* ("Those who do not wish to meet us will say: 'change the Qur'ān.' Say: 'and whence is it to me that I should change it by myself?' [8.6]"). This follows the Arabic closely except that *muta Alchoranum* is a paraphrase of a rather longer Arabic phrase: "bring a Qur'ān other than this one or change it" (*i'ti bi-Qur'ān ghair hādhā aw baddilhu*). It is very likely that the Arabic original of *Liber denudationis* contained the whole verse—quoting abridged and paraphrased verses in Arabic to a Muslim audience would be an ill-advised strategy for a Christian polemicist—and that this abbreviation was introduced at the point of translation or by some later reviser.

In general, therefore, while the translators appear to have abridged the contents of *Liber denudationis* to some extent—how much we cannot be certain—they otherwise seem to have adhered to the common practice of the Toledan translators of scientific and philosophical texts from Arabic: they too tended toward word-for-word literalism.⁸⁵ As a result, while we apparently have a shortened version of the work in its Latin translation, what we do have of it probably reflects the original Arabic contents quite faith-

⁸⁵ This is a much discussed phenomenon; see D. Lindberg, "The Transmission of Greek and Arabic Learning," p. 78, and T. Glick, *Islamic and Christian Spain in the Early Middle Ages*, pp. 273-74; S. Brock suggests that one reason for this may have been the perceived prestige of what he calls the "source" language; see his "Aspects of Translation Technique in Antiquity," p. 75.

fully.⁸⁶

We have no clear evidence regarding who effected this translation. The second colophon added by the seventeenth-century annotator indicates that the Latin text is from the “version of the Canon Marc,” and this led d’Alverny to suspect that it was translated by the famous Mozarab, Marc of Toledo, at the beginning of the thirteenth century.⁸⁷ But the ambiguity of this further colophon—it says nothing about this Canon Marc being from Spain or actually having translated it—and the fact that Marc’s other translations are much more readable than *Liber denudationis* led her to doubt this attribution.⁸⁸ If Ramon Lull read *Liber denudationis* in its Latin version, then it must have been translated before about 1299; this also would have been roughly the time when Riccoldo was using the Latin version.⁸⁹ Other than that we cannot be certain when the work was translated.

In *Liber denudationis*, therefore, we have a Latin translation and abridgement of a fairly lengthy Christian polemic against Islam, consisting primarily of a rather strident attack on the Prophet and his Holy Book together with an apology for the doctrine of the Incarnation, written originally in Arabic and most likely in Spain by a Mozarab who may well have been a convert from Islam.

The Letter of al-Qūṭī

While the *Liber denudationis* was written sometime between 1110 (or more likely 1085) and 1132, the brief apologetic and polemical

⁸⁶ Now there are, not surprisingly, outright mistakes in the translation of Qur’anic verses, such as when the Arabic *al-‘ālamūn*, “the worlds,” in verse 21:107 was misread as *al-‘ālimūn*, “the scholars” or “the wisemen,” and so translated *sapientes* (see *Liber denudationis* 8.4), and one must aware that these kinds of errors have marred the translation.

⁸⁷ “Superiora sunt ex Marci Canonici versione” (*Liber denudationis*, *apparatus criticus* to 12.9); M.-Th. d’Alverny, “Deux traductions,” p. 125, and Id. “La connaissance,” p. 592.

⁸⁸ See M.-Th. d’Alverny and G. Vajda, “Marc de Tolède, traducteur” p. 128-29, and cf. M.-Th. d’Alverny, “Marc de Tolède,” pp. 40-41.

⁸⁹ See above in this chapter.

tract which I shall refer to as *The Letter of al-Qūṭī* (i. e. “the Goth”) was apparently written sometime in the mid-1140’s. This untitled treatise was supposedly sent by an anonymous Mozarabic priest from Toledo to a learned young Andalusī Muslim named al-Khazrajī, and is only preserved in this al-Khazrajī’s much longer refutation of it entitled *Maqāmi‘ al-ṣulbān* (*Mallets for [Hammering] the Crosses*).⁹⁰ But while there is no doubt about the authenticity of al-Khazrajī’s refutation of this Toledan priest’s letter, fairly serious questions have been raised about whether the priest’s letter as it exists today is truly the work of a Christian as it purports to be. It is very likely, in fact, that this Mozarabic letter either was redacted considerably by later Muslim hands, or that it was actually composed in its current form by some Muslim polemicist on the basis of typical Mozarabic apologetic and polemic. The letter is, nevertheless, very useful for our purposes since, as will be apparent presently, it clearly reflects Mozarabic approaches to Islam in several ways.

Two brief prefaces prefixed respectively to *The Letter of al-Qūṭī* and al-Khazrajī’s response to it provide us with a modicum of information about the date, circumstances, and apparent identities of the two apologists. In rather vague language we are told in the first preface that after the people of Cordoba were dispersed by God’s decree, a bright young Cordoban man from the family of al-Khazrajī came to reside (*alḥaqa*) in Toledo. In the same city a Christian priest identified only as “one of the Goths (*min al-qūṭ*),”

⁹⁰ Edited by A. Charfī in al-Khazrajī (see list of abbreviations and short titles). *The Letter of al-Qūṭī* occupies pp. 30-39 of this edition. There is another more recent edition of the letter and al-Khazrajī’s response based on far fewer manuscripts by Muḥammad Shāmāh in his *Bayna al-Islām wa-al-Masīḥīyah: kitāb Abū ‘Abīdah al-Khazrajī* (Cairo, 1979), al-Qūṭī’s letter, together with copious, though not enormously useful notes, occupying pp. 68-146, al-Khazrajī’s response taking up the rest of the volume. My references will be to Charfī’s edition throughout. For more on this work see *Bibliographie* 21. 15, and 22. 16, *Islamochristiana* 2 (1976):200-201, 225 (n.b. that Kh. Samir noted, “Review,” p. 225, that he was preparing a new edition of *The Letter of al-Qūṭī*, but as far as I can determine, this new edition remains unpublished), M. de Epalza, “Notes pour une histoire des polémiques anti-chrétiennes,” p. 104, id., *La Tuhfa*, p. 71, and P. van Koningsveld, “La apología de al-Kindī,” pp. 109-10, 120-22.

had been attacking the Islamic faith of some of the other Muslims, and he wrote a brief refutation of Islam and defense of Christianity which he sent to al-Khazrajī.⁹¹ This first preface is then followed by the short letter of this Gothic priest, whom modern scholars have referred to simply as al-Qūṭī (“the Goth”), after which we are told in the second preface that when the Muslim al-Khazrajī had read it, he composed his own much longer reply consisting of the *Maqāmi‘ al-ṣulbān* itself, which then makes up the rest of the work.⁹² Although they may have been written by someone other than al-Khazrajī—perhaps by one of his later students⁹³—the prefaces appear to be at least partly accurate. It is well known that the mid-1140s were a period of enormous upheaval in Cordoba as Almoravid rule gave way before the Almohads, and it is reported that a member of the al-Khazrajī family named Aḥmad ibn ‘Abd al-Šamad al-Khazrajī (1125-1187) was taken prisoner and brought to Toledo where he was held for two years from c. 1145-1147, and that in that city he wrote a work known as the *Maqāmi‘ al-ṣulbān*.⁹⁴ As Abdelmajid Charfi and Fernando de la Granja have both observed, there is no way to know precisely why al-Khazrajī was taken to Toledo as a prisoner, but it seems likely that he was caught up in the conflict between Ibn Ghāniyah, the Almoravid governor of al-Andalus, and Abū Ja‘far ibn Ḥamdīn as they both attempted to take control of Cordoba during this unsettled period. Alfonso VII of Castile intervened extensively in this dispute, and at one point even controlled Cordoba for a short period himself, so that there were opportunities for a partisan of one side or the other to be taken captive to Toledo, which had been part of Christian Castile for more than fifty years by this time.⁹⁵

⁹¹ al-Khazrajī 1, pp. 29-30.

⁹² al-Khazrajī 10, p. 39.

⁹³ This is the view of the editor Abdelmajid Charfi; see his introduction to the text in al-Khazrajī, p. 14.

⁹⁴ F. de la Granja and A. Charfi, using the biographical collections and chronicles, have described these events in more detail; see de la Granja, “Milagros españoles en una obra musulmana,” pp. 318-23, and Charfi’s introduction to his edition of the work, al-Khazrajī, pp. 8-9.

⁹⁵ See de la Granja, *ibid.*, and Charfi, *ibid.*

There is little reason, in any case, to doubt that Aḥmad ibn ‘Abd al-Šamad al-Khazrajī is the author of the long Islamic refutation of al-Qūṭī’s letter in defense of Christianity. He was known to have been a scholar of the Ḥadīth who wrote several other works and this refutation is attributed to him in the earliest biographies.⁹⁶ The identity of the Toledan priest, however, cannot be established. Though the epithet al-Qūṭī was used by both Spanish Muslims and Mozarabs as a last name,⁹⁷ there is no record of a priest of Toledo with that name in this period.⁹⁸ Probably the name is employed in the preface to the letter in a generic sense only, meaning simply “the Goth.” The text of the letter itself does not even tell us this much, since its address is strictly anonymous: “from so-and-so to so-and-so.”⁹⁹

Whoever he is, the author covers a good deal of ground in very few pages, although he does so in rather disjointed fashion. After an invocation and summary of the Christian understanding of salvation history, he expresses his desire for his Muslim reader to know salvation personally (§ 2, pp. 30-31). He then argues that Jesus’ Sonship is demonstrated in the Qur’ān and that his miracles confirm this, as does the growth of the Church. Jesus came, he writes, so that God could address humanity Himself (*yukallimu al-nās bi-dhātihi*), after having communicated to men indirectly through the prophets. He therefore became incarnate and was both completely divine and completely human (§ 3, pp. 31-32). His mercy was so great that he consented to shed his blood on the cross at the hands of the Jews, and in so doing God was able to exact compensation for the sin of Adam from Jesus the Messiah. Yet even though both Jews and Christians confirm that Jesus died on the cross, Muslims persist in denying this, even though there is

⁹⁶ See Charfi’s introduction to his edition, al-Khazrajī, pp. 7-13; and also de la Granja, “Milagros españoles en una obra musulmana,” pp. 318-322.

⁹⁷ As D. Wasserstein points out the Muslim historian Ibn al-Qūṭiyah bears one form of this name (here meaning “Son of the Gothic woman”); see D. Wasserstein, *The Rise and Fall of the Party Kings*, p. 60, n. 6. The Mozarab Ḥafṣ Ibn Albar sometimes appears with the last name al-Qūṭī as well; see D. Dunlop, “Ḥafṣ Ibn Albar,” pp. 211-13.

⁹⁸ P. van Koningsveld, “La apología de al-Kindī,” p. 121.

⁹⁹ “Min fulān ilā fulān” (al-Qūṭī in al-Khazrajī 2, p. 30).

much moral soundness at the basis of their religion; if they only believe in the Messiah, their belief will be perfected (§ 4, pp. 33-34).

After quoting the *Pater noster* and mentioning the annual miracle of the fire in Jerusalem, and then explaining the great authority of the Church's patriarchs (§ 5, p. 34), the author argues next that Islam is untrue because it adds nothing new to Christianity and Judaism. The evidence of its untruth can be found in Qur'ānic laws allowing divorce and repeated divorce (§ 6, pp. 34-35). Moreover, the Qur'ān's untruth is further demonstrated by the lies which it perpetuates, such as its claim that St. Mary is the daughter of 'Imrān (§ 7, p. 36). After listing further disagreements between the Bible and the Qur'ān, the author asserts that the Islamic notion that Christians and Jews altered their scriptures to suit their own ungodly beliefs is merely part of Muslims' unbelief (§ 8, pp. 36-37). The miracles and holy lives of contemporaneous Christian saints attest the truth of the Church, while the carnal paradise preached by Islam is further evidence of its untruth (§ 9, pp. 37-38). After contrasting the peaceful spread of Christianity with the violent conquests of Islam and then similarly contrasting Jesus and Muḥammad, the author concludes his missive with a call for his reader to convert (§ 10, pp. 38-39).

Because of several conspicuous peculiarities and inconsistencies, however, the authenticity of the priest's letter in its present form has been severely challenged by Khalil Samir and Dominique Urvoy. As Samir has observed, many of the passages cited in the text as verses from the Bible are not Biblical at all, such as when the author asserts that the Torah says, "Whoever strikes you, strike him."¹⁰⁰ This sort of misrepresentation, he insists, would seem unlikely in a work written by a Christian priest. Furthermore, certain errors regarding Christian doctrine, together with the general weakness of the argument and disjointedness of the work, also raise doubts about whether a Christian priest could possibly have written it. All this led Samir to suggest that the letter was not written by a Christian at all, but was com-

¹⁰⁰ "Man laṭamaka fa-ilṭimhu" (al-Qūṭī in al-Khazrajī 6, p. 35); cf. Kh. Samir, "Review," p. 245, and Charfi's introduction, al-Khazrajī, p. 16.

posed by a Muslim—probably al-Khazrajī himself—who was familiar with the Christian polemical tradition against Islam.¹⁰¹

Furthermore, in his valuable study of the intellectual history of al-Andalus in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, Dominique Urvoy has recently come to the same conclusion as Samir, but for different reasons. What demonstrates the inauthenticity of the letter to him is its use of an argument “which does not appear among the Christians until the thirteenth century,” that is, that Islam is good in itself as far as it goes and its partisans need only accept Christianity to have their faith perfected. This apparently anachronistic view of Islam proves, in Urvoy’s view, that the Gothic priest’s letter is merely a literary artifice which provides a series of straw men for al-Khazrajī to bowl over in his *Maqāmi’ al-ṣulbān*.¹⁰²

Now some of these objections to the authenticity of al-Qūṭī’s letter are problematic in themselves. Professor Urvoy’s insistence, for example, that al-Qūṭī’s rather accommodating view of Islam is not found among Christians until the thirteenth century is simply not true. One of the Arabic versions of the eighth-century dialogue between the Catholicos Timothy I and the Caliph al-Mahdī, a work which—as Urvoy himself pointed out elsewhere—circulated in Spain, takes an equally accommodationist line with respect to Islam.¹⁰³ When asked by the Caliph what he thought about Muḥammad, the Catholicos answered that “Muḥammad deserves praise from all rational people” because he followed “the path of the prophets and all the lovers of God.” For like them he taught the oneness of God (*waḥdānīyah*) and turned his people away from the worship of demons and idols. Like them he taught that God

¹⁰¹ Kh. Samir, “Review,” pp. 245-48; see also *Bibliographie* 22. 16, *Islamochristiana* 2 (1976):225.

¹⁰² D. Urvoy, *Pensiers d'al-Andalus*, p. 166; cf. al-Qūṭī in al-Khazrajī 4, pp. 33-34. Though he does not say so here, Urvoy must be thinking of Ramon Lull’s apologetic enterprises in which he attempted to convince unbelievers of the truth of Christianity “by means of their faith” (*mediante fide*), not against it. See E. Longpré, “Lulle, Raymond (Le Bienheureux),” DTC 9/1, cols. 1123-25 and chapter six below.

¹⁰³ This work will be discussed at greater length in the next chapter; cf. D. Urvoy, “La pensée religieuse des Mozarabes,” pp. 422-23.

possesses a Word and a Spirit. "On account of this," the Catholicos remarked, "God has honored him (*karramahū*) greatly" and his religion has spread abroad in the world. "Who would not praise . . . that one whom God praised (*maddahahu*)?"¹⁰⁴ The presence of this sort of admiration for Muḥammad and his religion in a work which we know to have circulated among Mozarabs is enough to show that *The Letter of al-Qūṭī*'s accommodationist view of Islam is far from anachronistic.

Likewise, al-Qūṭī's misquotations of the Bible do not necessarily undermine the work's authenticity, as Samir contends, since other Christians, both Arab and European, have been known to be similarly inexact in quoting the Scriptures. For example, Theodore Abū Qurrah (d. c. 820), the great Melkite theologian and apologist, gave very free Arabic renderings of Biblical passages on more than one occasion.¹⁰⁵ Neither does the purported weakness of the argument of the Toledan priest's letter inherently bespeak inauthenticity. It may indeed seem rather feeble to us to expose the wrongness of Islamic marriage laws by simply citing Gospel passages to the contrary,¹⁰⁶ an approach which, Samir writes, "is more typical of Muslim apologists who meet a Biblical affirmation with a Qur'ānic affirmation."¹⁰⁷ But it need hardly be pointed out that European Christians were very fond indeed of this very approach: citing proof-texts from the Bible to counter Qur'ānic claims. As Norman Daniel has concluded, "it was the all but universal practice of the age to cite [the Bible in disputations with Muslims], even though no Muslim in real life would accept

¹⁰⁴ Ṭimāthāwus, *al-Muḥāwarah al-dīnīyah* 1.46, 49 (mulḥaq), pp. 150-52 (cf. Caspar's assessment of this passage's authenticity, *ibid.*, p. 123-24); *id.*, *al-Muḥāwarah al-dīnīyah* 2, pp. 373-74.

¹⁰⁵ See his *Maymār fī wujūd al-khāliq wa-al-dīn al-qawīm* 2. 14, 2. 16, pp. 251, 1. 19; 252, 1. 22; 267, 1. 40; R. Haddad confirms the opinion of A. S. Tritton that Abū Qurrah quoted the scriptures from memory and notes in general that "Les textes bibliques sous la plume des théologiens arabes, sont cités très librement" (R. Haddad, *La Trinité divine*, pp. 105-06).

¹⁰⁶ al-Qūṭī in al-Khazrajī 6, p. 35.

¹⁰⁷ "De plus, il nous semble que cette manière de faire est plus typique des apologistes musulmans, qui opposent à une affirmation biblique une affirmation coranique" (Kh. Samir, "Review," p. 247).

it."¹⁰⁸ Hence the anonymous Mozarabic author of the *Tathlith al-wahḍānīyah* (which will be discussed presently) insisted on quoting much of the Genesis account of Sarah, Hagar, and Ishmael, assuming that his Muslim reader would necessarily heed the words of the Old Testament;¹⁰⁹ on a larger scale this is also what countless European polemicists did in ridiculing the account of Zayd, Zaynab, and the Prophet as told in sūrah 33: countering the Qur'ān's story of infatuation, repudiation, and remarriage with the Gospel's proscription of divorce.¹¹⁰

Nevertheless, certain of Samir's objections cannot be so easily countered. Some of the scriptural quotations in al-Qūṭī's letter are not simply loose renderings of identifiable Biblical passages; they are, rather, phrases that cannot be found in the Bible at all, such as the author's insistence that the Bible portrays Satan saying, "I am made of fire and have not a creator. Make me therefore a throne upon which I will be like the Most High."¹¹¹ This statement with its Qur'ānic overtones would, according to Samir, seem far more typical of a Muslim concocting a Christian view of Satan than of a Christian writing within his own tradition.¹¹² Furthermore, Samir is surely correct in suspecting that no author who purports to be a Christian priest could possibly describe God as three hypostases (*aqānīm*) in one hypostasis (*uqnūm*)¹¹³ when the universal formula is three hypostases in one substance (*jawhar*).¹¹⁴ The letter in its current form does not seem to be wholly the work of a Christian priest, therefore.

But at the same time much of the content of the letter itself is quite representative of traditional Christian apologetic and anti-

¹⁰⁸ N. Daniel, *Islam and the West*, pp. 54-55; cf. p. 253.

¹⁰⁹ al-Qurṭubī, p. 216-17.

¹¹⁰ On the Latin Christian polemical use of this incident see N. Daniel, *Islam and the West*, pp. 97-99; for its use in the other works studied here see Petrus Alfonsi's *Dialogus* 5, PL 157:601c and the anonymous *Liber denudationis* 7.9-10.

¹¹¹ "Anā min nār wa-lā khāliq lī; fa-ij'alū lī kursīan akūnu 'alayhi shibhan al-'Alī" (al-Qūṭī in al-Khazraǧī 8, p. 37); cf. Kh. Samir, "Review," p. 245.

¹¹² Kh. Samir, "Review," p. 245; cf. verse 15:27 of the Qur'ān.

¹¹³ al-Qūṭī in al-Khazraǧī 2, p. 31.

¹¹⁴ Kh. Samir, "Review," p. 245.

Islamic polemic. Indeed, as Charfi has observed, despite the doctrinal and other flaws mentioned by Samir, the treatise has a thoroughly Christian apologetic tone,¹¹⁵ much of its contents, in fact, echoing the themes of the great Oriental Arab-Christian refutation of Islam, *The Apology of al-Kindī*.¹¹⁶ Furthermore, as Samir himself first pointed out, al-Qūṭī's letter contains neologistic Arabic calques based on Latin models, as well as other passages which probably were translated from Latin.¹¹⁷ These passages, therefore, certainly reflect Mozarabic apologetic and polemic.

There is really satisfactory no way to explain this rather complex situation other than to assume that some Muslim—perhaps al-Khazrajī himself, as Samir suggested—either reworked an apologetic letter originally written by a Mozarab, or wrote the whole of the letter himself as the object for his own attack on Christianity, but did so on the basis of his knowledge of Mozarabic and other Arab-Christian refutations of Islam. Practically, therefore, this means both that *The Letter of al-Qūṭī* does shed light on how Mozarabs learned about Islam and attempted to refute its claims, and that it must, at the same time, be used with considerable caution in this connection, since the authentically Christian contents of the work cannot always be easily distinguished from the views of the Muslim redactor. As a result, I have only used it as evidence for how Mozarabs approached Islam intellectually when its testimony is confirmed by one of the other main sources.

Tathlith al-wahḍānīyah

While fairly serious questions can be raised about the authenticity of *The Letter of al-Qūṭī*, there is little doubt that the remaining

¹¹⁵ See A. Charfi's introduction to al-Khazrajī, p. 16.

¹¹⁶ See P. van Koningsveld, "La apología de al-Kindī," p. 122, n. 31; the *Apology* will be discussed at greater length in the next chapter.

¹¹⁷ See Kh. Samir, "Review," pp. 246, 253, and the following chapter of this study; cf. B. Lewis, *The Muslim Discovery of Europe*, pp. 72-73.

two apologetic treatises are, in fact, the creations of Mozarabs, and that they were both written sometime between c. 1120 and 1200. Yet none of this is clear initially, since, like al-Qūṭī's tract, both these short works are preserved only as they are quoted in a much longer Muslim work. In the form in which we have them, moreover, not only is one of the works anonymous, but about neither work are we given much explicit information about origin, provenance, or date of composition. What allows us to locate them fairly confidently in time and place is their rather remarkable contents.

The lengthy work that preserves these two tracts is attributed to an otherwise unknown Andalusī Muslim identified only as the Cordoban Imām (*al-imām al-Qurṭubī*; I shall refer to him as al-Qurṭubī for convenience' sake).¹¹⁸ It carries the rather weighty title of *Information about the Corruption and Delusions of the Christians, and Presentation of the Merits of the Religion of Islam, and Affirmation of the Prophethood of Our Prophet Muḥammad*;¹¹⁹ and it is actually the refutation of the longer of the

¹¹⁸ Several scholars have speculated about the identity of this man, Brockelmann asserting that he is Shams al-Dīn ibn Farḥ al-Anṣārī al-Qurṭubī (d. 1273) who wrote a well-known commentary on the Qur'ān (see C. Brockelmann, *Geschichte der arabischen Literatur*, SI, p. 737), while Devillard and Epalza both argue that he is probably the jurist Abū Ja'far ibn Naṣr al-Rawadī al-Qurṭubī, author in 1278 of the *Kitāb al-amwāl* (see P. Devillard, "Thèse sur al-Qurṭubī (introduction)," pp. 19-20, and M. de Epalza, "Notes pour une histoire des polémiques anti-chrétiennes," p. 104). But P. van Koningsveld has cogently argued that the work had to have been written early the thirteenth century on the basis of internal evidence which I will recount a few pages hence. Therefore neither of these alternatives can be correct.

¹¹⁹ Imām al-Qurṭubī, *al-flām bi-mā fī dīn al-naṣārā min al-fasād wa-awḥām wa-iẓhār maḥāsin dīn al-islām wa-iḥbāt nubuwwat nabīnā Muḥammad 'alayhi al-ṣalāt wa-al-salām*, ed. Aḥmad Hijāzī al-Saqqā, Cairo, 1980, cited elsewhere in this study as "al-Qurṭubī." Cf. C. Brockelmann, *Geschichte der arabischen Literatur*, SI, p. 737; M. de Epalza, "Notes pour une histoire des polémiques anti-chrétiennes," p. 104; Id., *La Tuhfa*, p. 71; P. van Koningsveld, "La apología de al-Kindī," pp. 110-11, 123-29. The first two parts of this work were edited, translated and briefly studied by P. Devillard in his "Thèse sur al-Qurṭubī;" and the second part was edited and studied by Abdallah Khlaifi in a thesis (which I have not been able to consult) at the University of Tunis (see A. Charfi's review of A. Bouamama, *La littérature polémique, Islamochristiana* 17 [1991]:316). All my references will be to the Cairo edition, although I will occasionally cite Devillard's readings.

these two Mozarabic tracts. This longer Mozarabic tract bears a memorable title of its own: *Tathlīth al-waḥdānīyah*,¹²⁰ a phrase which in this context—as the sequel will show—properly means something like *Trinitizing the Unity [of God]*.¹²¹ Now Imām al-Qurṭubī tells us that this treatise was written by “one of those who embraced the religion of the community of the Christians,” and that it was sent from Toledo to Cordoba where he encountered it and eventually wrote a refutation of it.¹²² This is all the explicit information we have about its author, date, and provenance.

Consisting of 383 lines quoted in sections of varying length throughout the first half of al-Qurṭubī’s lengthy treatise,¹²³ *Tathlīth al-waḥdānīyah* is only about twelve pages long altogether. Like *The Letter of al-Qūṭī*, it covers several topics in a narrow compass. These contents, however, are only partially suggested by the title, for only the first of the three distinct sections of the work concerns the Trinity. In this first section the author attempts to demonstrate in a fairly rationalistic fashion that God is necessarily triune, arguing that God could only have created through His power, knowledge, and will, because all actions require these three faculties. These three faculties, however, are merely other names for the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit which are three persons in one undivided substance.¹²⁴

This argument is then followed in the second section by an apology for the doctrine of the Incarnation. Here the author argues

¹²⁰ See al-Qurṭubī, pp. 43, 47. Cf. M. de Epalza, “Notes pour une histoire des polémiques anti-chrétiennes,” p. 104, Id., *La Tuhfa*, p. 71, P. van Koningsveld, “La apología de al-Kindī,” pp. 110-11, 123-29.

¹²¹ *tathlīth* is a verbal noun which literally means “to make three,” just as *tawḥīd*, the word usually used for “monotheism” literally means “to make one,” and here I think the verbal force of *tathlīth* must be preserved, for the thrust of the first third of the work is precisely to “make” the unity which Muslims declare to be the essential property of the Godhead into a trinity. But n. b. that the phrase *tathlīth al-waḥdānīyah* itself is found elsewhere in Arab-Christian theology usually meaning simply “the Trinity” or “the triune nature of God;” see the excerpts of the anonymous ninth-century Palestinian-Christian work, *al-Kitāb al-jāmiʿ*, p. 1015; and cf. R. Haddad, *La Trinité divine*, pp. 206-07.

¹²² “Baʿd al-muntaḥilīn li-dīn al-millāh al-naṣrānīyah” (al-Qurṭubī, p. 42).

¹²³ In the following passages of al-Qurṭubī: pp. 47, 57, 71, 77, 91, 97, 105-106, 115-117, 163-165, 177, 181-185, 215-17.

¹²⁴ *Tathlīth al-waḥdānīyah* in al-Qurṭubī, pp. 57, 63, 71, and 77.

that it is the nature of God's knowledge—that is His Son—to be born as a Word, and this Word became incarnate in order to exhort mankind. Christians believe this only out of obedient acceptance (*taqlīdan*) of the Gospels and prophets. They do not believe, moreover, as some have charged, that the eternal God became a temporal being, or that the Creator became a created thing. Rather, they believe that a temporal thing became God just as a lump of coal becomes fire. This happened, moreover, simply because God willed it, just as He willed creation. The Qur'ān itself gives evidence that such a thing can happen when it relates (in vv. 20:9ff for example) how God spoke to Moses from the burning bush; obviously the speech of God in the fire was an intermediary between God and man, and, moreover, Moses worshipped it just as the voice itself commanded. Since the voice of the fire saying "I am God" was true, so also did Jesus speak truly when He said, "I am God."¹²⁵

In the last section of the work, the author attempts to demonstrate on the basis of scripture that the Messiah has indeed come as the Incarnate Word of God. An intriguing preface introduces this argument. Men of all three faiths—Jews, Christians, and Muslims—go about proclaiming their own religion as the only true one, the author observes, and most of them do so for worldly motives and without knowledge of proper argumentation. Furthermore, if a pagan (*majūsī*)¹²⁶ came to our land seeking which of these faiths were true, he would find a rather confusing situation: men of all three religions believe that the Jewish prophets are true, but Christians say that the New Testament abrogates the Jewish scriptures, and Muslims say that the Qur'ān abrogates the Christian scriptures, and Jews merely argue that there are no true

¹²⁵ *Tathlīth al-wahdānīyah* in al-Qurṭubī, pp. 91, 97, 105-06, 115-117.

¹²⁶ Normally in Arabic the word *majūs* refers to Zoroastrians, but in al-Andalus and the Maghrib the term referred to the Vikings or Northmen (and other European pagans), probably because their religion reminded these western Muslims of Zoroastrianism (see "al-Maḍjūs," EI² 5:1118-21 [art. A. Melvinger]). Mozarabs appear to have taken this a step farther, using the term to refer to any pagan or, perhaps, non-Christian, European or otherwise. The contemporary *Glossarium latino-arabicum*, p. 361, defines *paganus* ("pagan") as *majūsī* ("Magus", or "Zoroastrian") and *khārijī* ("foreigner").

scriptures other than their own. In order to convince such a learned man, therefore, Christians must produce evidence from the Jewish scriptures which demonstrates that the Messiah has come, and Muslims must likewise produce evidence from the Christian and Jewish scriptures to prove that Muḥammad's coming was prophesied by the Bible. Whoever can so demonstrate his view to be right is a believer in the true faith.¹²⁷

This story establishes the outline of what follows. The author first argues at some length that the Jewish scriptures confirm that the Messiah has come. Here his argument follows a typical ancient- and medieval-Christian strategy in anti-Jewish polemic: first he cites Old Testament passages such as Genesis 49:10 and Jeremiah 31:31-34 which foretell the Israelites' loss of dominion and prophesy a new covenant; he then argues that these prophecies have been fulfilled since the time of the advent of Jesus and the founding of the Church.¹²⁸ What is extraordinary here is that the author cites these verses first in Hebrew or Aramaic, transliterated into Arabic script, and then translates them into Arabic so that he can say,

Notice that I have written down for you in the Hebrew language and the Aramaic language some of the scriptural evidences of the prophets sent by God from the books in their (i. e. the Jews') hands, and that the Jews are not able [therefore] to deny a word of them when I advance [these scriptural evidences] in argument with them in Hebrew and Aramaic.¹²⁹

Having argued for the validity of Christianity on the basis of the Jewish scriptures, the author then appeals to Muslims to do

¹²⁷ *Tathlīḥ al-waḥdānīyah* in al-Qurṭubī, pp. 163-65.

¹²⁸ *Tathlīḥ al-waḥdānīyah* in al-Qurṭubī, pp. 181-185. The other verses cited are Os 3:4, Jer 3:13-16, 15:1-2, and Prov 30:3-4. Many of these verses are cited in other earlier and contemporary Christian-Jewish polemics; Gen 49:10, for example, was, according to B. Blumenkranz, a particular favorite, interpreted from the earliest Christian centuries in just the way the anonymous author of *Tathlīḥ al-waḥdānīyah* does (see his *Juifs et chrétiens*, pp. 227-237; for another Arab-Christian example of its use in this way see Eutychius of Alexandria's *Kuāb al-burhān* 4, CSCO 209 [Ss. Arabici 22]:120, ¶ 620).

¹²⁹ "ʾIḥām annī katabtu la-ka bi-al-ʿibrānī wa-al-suryānī min shahādāt al-anbiyāʾ ʿan Allāh min al-kutub allatī bi-aydihim wa-anna al-yahūd lā yaqdirūna ʿalā inkār ḥarfīn min-hā idhā aḥtajjū maʿa-hum bi-al-ʿibrānī wa-al-suryānī" (*Tathlīḥ al-waḥdānīyah* in al-Qurṭubī, p. 185).

likewise, but notes that Christians will not accept the Islamic revelation anyway since it contains such vile provisions as marriage laws which encourage adultery. He concludes by arguing that the Bible clearly indicates that Ishmael and Hagar—and with them the Muslims—are excluded from God's covenant with Abraham. Therefore, the author admonishes his reader in closing, "believe in the religious law (*sharīʿah*)¹³⁰ of the Messiah" which, as he has shown, is the "true faith" (*ḥaqīqat al-īmān*).¹³¹

Though there are reasons to suppose that these three distinct sections may not originally have been part of the same work by the same author, I do not think it likely. For although the title given by al-Qurṭubī to this Christian work clearly relates only to the contents of the first section on the Trinity, it is clear, nevertheless, that the second section is a continuation of the first, since the argument there presupposes the foregoing discussion of the Trinity. The author, for example, has an imaginary Muslim interlocutor remark that "the Trinity in your opinion [refers to] the names of actions of persons subsisting [in the one God]. . ." This statement merely reiterates the description of the Trinity set forth in section one.¹³² That the third section is necessarily part of the same work is not so clear. Its first phrase, as al-Qurṭubī quotes it, reads as follows: "The beginning of the argument of the three religious communities."¹³³ This could easily be the beginning of a completely different work that perhaps had come to circulate with *Tathlith al-waḥdānīyah*, or which al-Qurṭubī refutes here after having disposed of the previous work. Yet al-Qurṭubī clearly believes it to be part of *Tathlith al-waḥdānīyah*, and a demonstra-

¹³⁰ This is, of course, a very Islamic term, normally used only to refer to the set of laws and customs derived from the Qurʾān and Ḥadīth.

¹³¹ *Tathlith al-waḥdānīyah* in al-Qurṭubī, pp. 215-17. A rather tangled passage (p. 216) prefacing the discussion of Ishmael may indicate that the author of *Tathlith al-waḥdānīyah* had written an earlier treatise about this issue—still another lost polemical work from this period?

¹³² "Fa-idhā kāna al-tathlith 'inda-kum asmā' af'al li-khawāṣṣ qā'imah. . ." (*Tathlith al-waḥdānīyah* in al-Qurṭubī, p. 91; cf. 1.3, p. 71). For this meaning of *khawāṣṣ* (pl. *khawāṣṣ*), see ch. 3 below, and R. Haddad, *La Trinité divine*, p. 155.

¹³³ "Ibūdā' ihtijāj al-thalāth milal" (*Tathlith al-waḥdānīyah* in al-Qurṭubī, p. 163).

tion that the Messiah has really come based on scripture is a logical next step after having shown the possibility of the Incarnation using reason. For these two reasons, I believe that section three was also written by the author of the first two sections. The peculiar beginning of it may be nothing more than the first line of a new section in the original work. It would appear, however, that al-Qurṭubī may not have quoted the whole of the work. As van Koningsveld has observed the demonstration of the Trinity as the Imām records it seems to presuppose some missing previous section: "It is necessary now (*al-ān*) that I ask you . . ." ¹³⁴

Two clues point to the Spanish or Andalusī origin of *Tathlith al-waḥdānīyah*. The first of these is al-Qurṭubī's statement that the work was sent from Toledo to Cordoba where he encountered it; from this statement we know at least that the work circulated in Spain.¹³⁵ Secondly, it is clear from both the presence in the work of Arabic neologistic calques based on Latin¹³⁶ and the Augustinian elements of its Trinitarian argumentation that this treatise was written by someone having knowledge of Latin-Christian theology.¹³⁷ Since there were almost no Latin patristic works available in Arabic in the Middle East,¹³⁸ such a person could only have been an Iberian Christian at home with both Arabic and Latin.

Professor van Koningsveld has observed, moreover, that the remarkable use by the author of the Hebrew and Aramaic versions of the Bible is almost conclusive proof that he was a *converso* Jew, since knowledge of Hebrew and Aramaic by non-Jews in Christian or Islamic Spain was virtually non-existent.¹³⁹ We have

¹³⁴ *Tathlith al-waḥdānīyah* in al-Qurṭubī, p. 57; cf. P. van Koningsveld, "La apología de al-Kindī," p. 123, n. 35.

¹³⁵ al-Qurṭubī, p. 43.

¹³⁶ E. g. *iltāḥamat al-kalimah*, "the word became flesh," *iltāḥama* being the literal translation of the Latin *incarnatus est*; cf. Kh. Samir, "Review," p. 253.

¹³⁷ This will be discussed in greater detail in chapter five below.

¹³⁸ Though Graf lists Arabic translations of dozens of Greek and Syriac patristic works in his history of Arab Christian literature (see his *Geschichte der christlichen arabischen Literatur* 1, pp. 298-483), he only mentions Arabic translations of one Latin patristic author, John Cassian, and these only by way of intervening Greek translations; see *Ibid.*, pp. 299, 401.

¹³⁹ P. van Koningsveld, "La apología de al-Kindī," pp. 127-29; B. Lewis, *The Muslim Discovery of Europe*, pp. 70-73.

clear proof in the person of Petrus Alfonsi (fl. 1106-20) that there were converted Jews in Spain with just the linguistic background necessary for writing this treatise, and van Koningsveld has suggested that Petrus Alfonsi may actually be the author of *Tathlith al-wahdānīyah* because there are some intriguing parallels between that work and Petrus' *Dialogi* against the Jews.¹⁴⁰ At one point al-Qurṭubī implies that this Mozarabic author is a layman, but in another passage he refers to him as a priest. Though the latter is probably more likely, the case of Petrus Alfonsi, a very learned lay Christian apologist, indicates that the former is a possibility too.¹⁴¹ Unfortunately, however, beyond the facts that he is probably a *converso* Jew from the Iberian Peninsula who may or may not be a priest, we know nothing else about this Mozarabic apologist.

There is a clear *terminus ante quem* for the date of the composition of the work provided by al-Qurṭubī himself, when he says in the text that in his time Islam was a little more than six hundred years old (*la-hu sittumi'ah sanah wa-nayyif min al-a'wām*).¹⁴² Since he was calculating the age of Islam in lunar years, this means that he wrote in the very early thirteenth century, and that *Tathlith al-wahdānīyah* was clearly completed before then.¹⁴³ A variety of evidence points to a *terminus a quo* of sometime in the mid-twelfth century.¹⁴⁴ As van Koningsveld has pointed out, al-

¹⁴⁰ Petrus will be discussed at greater length later in this chapter.

¹⁴¹ "You are one of the laymen of the Christians (*min 'awāmm al-Masīḥiyyīn*) . . ." (al-Qurṭubī, p. 166; cf. P. van Koningsveld, "La apología de al-Kindī," pp. 123-24 (esp. n. 35), 126-29; "So notice, O priest (*al-qiss*), if you are one of the people of intelligence and insight (*ḥads*) . . ." (al-Qurṭubī, p. 317).

¹⁴² al-Qurṭubī p. 277; see also P. van Koningsveld, "La apología de al-Kindī," pp. 110-11, nn. 4, 5. Devillard's unpublished edition of the first third of al-Qurṭubī's work does not include this passage which is found in a later part of the text. This may explain why he believed the work to have been written much later (1285-86). See P. Devillard, "Thèse sur al-Qurṭubī (introduction)," pp. 1-2.

¹⁴³ Six hundred lunar years equals approximately five hundred eighty-two solar years. Five hundred eighty-two solar years after the Hijrah (622 AD) would be the year 1204.

¹⁴⁴ P. van Koningsveld has so dated the work, but on the basis of an argument which I do not find convincing. He argues that the work's abrupt beginning suggests that it is a continuation of some other similar work. "The most probable hypothesis," he argues, "is that the author [of *Tathlith al-wahdānīyah*] is here continuing the disputation between al-Qūṭī and al-Khazrajī," making it thus the

Qurṭubī criticizes the author of *Tathlith al-waḥdānīyah* for having lifted the beginning of his tract from the now-lost apologetic letter of ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn GhṣN which was sent to Abū Marwān ibn Maysarraḥ who died in 1157.¹⁴⁵ This means that al-Qurṭubī thought that *Tathlith al-waḥdānīyah* was written sometime *after* the lost *risālah* of Ibn Maysarraḥ, which would itself have been written in a period from roughly 1130 to 1157.

Al-Qurṭubī, of course, could well have been incorrect about this, but several other features of *Tathlith al-waḥdānīyah*’s contents suggest a similar *terminus a quo*. First of all, as I will argue in chapter five, much of what explains the Augustinian cast of *Tathlith al-waḥdānīyah*’s Trinitarian argumentation is the fact that its author relied heavily on the theology of Peter Abelard (d. 1142) and other twelfth-century thinkers such as Hugh of St. Victor (d. 1141). In particular, he adopted and adapted a triad of attributes invented by Abelard—power (*potentia*), knowledge (*scientia*), and will (*voluntas*)—and, like Abelard and Hugh, used it to explain the Trinity, only now in the Arabic form of *qudrah-‘ilm-irādah*. While it is possible that such ideas became known among Mozarabs as early as, say, 1120,¹⁴⁶ it is far more likely that, given the frontier nature of Christian Spain, they became well known there only some years later.

Furthermore, as I will show in chapters three and five, the argumentation of this treatise was also highly influenced by the *Kalām*, or Islamic philosophical theology. But although kalāmīc thought had always been present in Andalusī-Muslim circles in a limited way, it did not become particularly important until the twelfth century.¹⁴⁷ Particularly conspicuous, moreover, are the similarities between *Tathlith al-waḥdānīyah*’s argumentation and the specific kind of *Kalām* adopted by the founder of the Almohad

sequel to *The Letter of al-Quṭī*, which was written in the mid-1140s. See P. van Koningsveld, “La apología de al-Kindī,” pp. 123-24, n. 35. It seems to me that the abrupt beginning could be explained just as well otherwise; see just above in this chapter.

¹⁴⁵ P. van Koningsveld, “La apología de al-Kindī,” p. 124.

¹⁴⁶ All this will be covered in detail in chapter five below.

¹⁴⁷ See D. Urvoy, *Pensers d’al-Andalus*, p. 165 and ff.

dynasty, Ibn Tūmart (d. c. 1130). Indeed, *Tathlīth al-waḥdānīyah*'s very title is a brash and etymologically apt denial of the passionate belief in God's absolute oneness which informed Ibn Tūmart's movement (*al-Muwahḥidūn* = "those who affirm the absolute oneness of God").¹⁴⁸ But more importantly, the marked rationalism of *Tathlīth al-waḥdānīyah*'s argumentation is thoroughly in line with Ibn Tūmart's rationalism.¹⁴⁹ "There is no god," the *Mahdī* wrote, "but the one of whom existing things give evidence (*dallat 'alayhi al-mawjūdāt*) and for whom created things bear witness of the necessity of His existence (*wujūd*)."¹⁵⁰ In a similar vein, the author of *Tathlīth al-waḥdānīyah* stipulates that his proof of the triune nature of the Godhead is based only on what we know of God from what we can see of His actions in creation.¹⁵¹ Both authors, moreover, avoid using the the normal term *ṣifah* (pl. *ṣifāt*, = "attribute") to describe God's attributes, peculiarly preferring instead to speak only of God's names (*asmā'*).¹⁵² Ibn Tūmart's works, moreover, were known to have circulated among the Christian population of the Peninsula because in 1213 Marc of Toledo translated two of Ibn Tūmart's prayers and his so-called '*aqīdah*' into Latin.¹⁵³ All this suggests that *Tathlīth al-waḥdānīyah* is a direct Christian response to the religious thought of the Almohads who entered Spain only in the late 1140s. *Tathlīth al-waḥdānīyah*, therefore, was certainly written before the early 1300's and after 1120 when Abelard first

¹⁴⁸ Not surprisingly, of course, *waḥdānīyah* in the sense of God's unity appears prominently in the theological writings of (or attributed to) Ibn Tūmart; see his so-called '*aqīdah*' 7 in J. Luciani, *Le livre de Mohammed Ibn Tūmert*, p. 234, and the first of his so-called *murshidāhs*, *ibid.*, p. 241.

¹⁴⁹ See D. Urvoy, "La pensée d'Ibn Tūmart," pp. 23-30, *passim*; *id.*, *Pensers d'al-Andalus*, p. 171; *id.*, *Ibn Rushd*, pp. 18-20, 80-81; and M. Fletcher, "The Almohad Tawḥīd," *passim*.

¹⁵⁰ Ibn Tūmart, *Murshīdah* 1, in J. Luciani, *Le livre de Mohammed Ibn Tūmert*, p. 240.

¹⁵¹ *Tathlīth al-waḥdānīyah* in al-Qurṭubī, p. 47; this passage will be discussed further in chapter five below.

¹⁵² See M. Fletcher, "The Almohad Tawḥīd," p. 116; and D. Urvoy, *Pensers d'al-Andalus*, p. 172.

¹⁵³ See D. Urvoy, *Pensers d'al-Andalus*, p. 95; cf. M.-Th. d'Alverny, "Marc de Tolède," p. 43.

propounded the ideas which later show up in this tract, and more probably after about 1150 when Ibn Tūmart's particular variety of *Kalām* became widespread in Spain.

The Maṣḥaf al-‘ālam al-kā’in of Aghushtīn

The other twelfth-century Mozarabic apologetic treatise which al-Qurṭubī preserves in the *al-Fīlām* is a work which he says is entitled *The Book of the Existing World* (*Maṣḥaf al-‘ālam al-kā’in*) which he attributes to a Christian bishop named Aghushtīn.¹⁵⁴ Now Imām al-Qurṭubī speaks of this Aghushtīn in terms which suggest that he is St. Augustine, the great bishop of Hippo,¹⁵⁵ and Aḥmad Ḥijāzī al-Saqqā, the work's modern editor, identifies him as such.¹⁵⁶ But as the content of the work itself indicates, this can hardly be the case, since it was obviously written in response to Islam and even quotes verses from the Qur’ān.¹⁵⁷ Whoever this Aghushtīn is—and the content of the work itself is our only clue—al-Qurṭubī quotes extensive passages from his book in the course of refuting the arguments of *Tathlīth al-waḥdānīyah* which, of course, are al-Qurṭubī's main target. Al-Qurṭubī's strategy here is to show that the author of *Tathlīth al-waḥdānīyah* is often not in agreement with the views of this great Aghushtīn, and that when he is, he nevertheless fails to understand what Aghushtīn taught. This surprising polemical approach, by the way, is simply the natural corollary to al-Qurṭubī's frequent *ad hominem* attacks on the author of *Tathlīth al-waḥdānīyah*.¹⁵⁸

¹⁵⁴ al-Qurṭubī, p. 69.

¹⁵⁵ See, e. g., al-Qurṭubī, p. 81: "the teaching (*madhhab*) of their great one, Aghushūn . . ." and p. 148: "I recount this only because you know that the Christians support their teachings on this man [i. e. Aghushūn] (*‘umdat al-Naṣārā ‘alā hādha al-rajul bi-madhāhibihim*);" cf. P. Devillard, "Thèse sur al-Qurṭubī (introduction)," p. 15.

¹⁵⁶ See note 2 on pp. 57-58 of al-Qurṭubī

¹⁵⁷ See also here P. Devillard, "Thèse sur al-Qurṭubī (introduction)," p. 15.

¹⁵⁸ See, e. g., p. 57: "if you were one of those who have profit (*naṣīb*) in their reflection, . . . then you would have imitated (*iqṭadayta*) your leading teacher (*mu‘allimukum al-aẓ‘am*) and your greatest bishop Aghushūn;" and p. 126. Cf. D. Urvoý, *Pensers d'al-Andalus*, p. 167.

While there are a number of references to the ideas of this Aghushtīn in al-Qurṭubī's treatise,¹⁵⁹ there are only two extensive quotations from his treatise, and al-Qurṭubī clearly chose them because they contain arguments very similar to those presented in the first two sections of *Tathlīth al-waḥdānīyah*. After quoting these two passages from Aghushtīn's *maṣḥaf*, al-Qurṭubī then compares their arguments to those of *Tathlīth al-waḥdānīyah* and shows the latter to be deficient. But, in fact, the general lines of thought pursued in these two fragments of Aghushtīn's *maṣḥaf* are virtually identical to those of the author of *Tathlīth al-waḥdānīyah*. In the first extensive fragment Aghushtīn argues, like the author of *Tathlīth al-waḥdānīyah*, that God possesses the attributes of power, knowledge, and will which, unlike the other attributes frequently ascribed to God (such as mercy), are eternally present in God, and these correspond to the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit: therefore God is demonstrated to be a Trinity on the basis of reason alone. In the second fragment he argues—once again like the author of *Tathlīth al-waḥdānīyah*—that God's communication to Moses in the burning bush as recorded in the Qur'ān demonstrates the possibility of Incarnation.¹⁶⁰ What we have of Aghushtīn's treatise, therefore, are only those passages which are very similar to the first two parts of *Tathlīth al-waḥdānīyah*.¹⁶¹ Almost certainly there was much more to this work than these two

¹⁵⁹ Al-Qurṭubī mentions or quotes Aghushtīn in the following places: pp. 57-58, 69, 72, 81-83, 86, 110, 126, 128, 143-48, 156; cf. P. van Koningsveld, "La apología de al-Kindī," p. 125, n. 38. Devillard believed that al-Qurṭubī was actually quoting from two different works of Aghushtīn, the *maṣḥaf* already mentioned, and what he called "la réfutation de Porphyre;" see P. Devillard, "Thèse sur al-Qurṭubī (introduction)," pp. 15-18. There is, however, no textual evidence for this, since al-Qurṭubī gives no indication in the passages that he attributes to Aghushtīn that he is quoting any work besides Aghushtīn's *Maṣḥaf al-ʿālam al-kāʾin*. I will discuss the significance of the peculiar references to Porphyry in this passage below in chapter five.

¹⁶⁰ See Aghushtīn in al-Qurṭubī, pp. 81-83, 143-47. Both these arguments will be discussed at much greater length in chapters five and three respectively.

¹⁶¹ And even these appear to have been abbreviated in part as al-Qurṭubī indicates just before he quotes the second fragment: "But I will summarize (*akhtaṣiru*) from his argument (*kalām*) . . . without doing violence to his wording (*lafẓ*) or neglecting his meaning" (al-Qurṭubī, p. 143).

fragments and the other much shorter quotations from it—there must have been, for al-Qurṭubī says at one point that he plans to rebutt Aghushtīn's views in another book.¹⁶²

Though we possess much less of Aghushtīn's *Maṣḥaf al-ʿālam al-kā'in* than we do of *Tathlīth al-waḥdānīyah*, the few fragments we do have are sufficient to date it modestly well. Its *terminus ante quem* is, of course, the same as *Tathlīth al-waḥdānīyah*'s: the early 13th century, when al-Qurṭubī wrote his *al-Fīlām*. Furthermore, in the first lengthy fragment, Aghushtīn uses the same Abelardian triad of power, knowledge, and will that was central to *Tathlīth al-waḥdānīyah*'s Trinitarian argument. Therefore its *terminus a quo*, again like *Tathlīth al-waḥdānīyah*'s, must certainly be c. 1120, when Abelard began using his notorious triad. Moreover, just as *Tathlīth al-waḥdānīyah* contained strongly kalāmīc language and arguments, so also does Aghushtīn's tract, which also indicates that it was written sometime in the twelfth century. This tract does not, however, have as many clear parallels to Ibn Tūmart's thought, so it is likely that Aghushtīn wrote before the Almohad conquest of the Peninsula. Al-Qurṭubī implies that Aghushtīn's *maṣḥaf* was completed before the author of *Tathlīth al-waḥdānīyah* began his work; though he could have been misinformed, this also suggests that Aghushtīn wrote before 1150 or so.¹⁶³ While *Maṣḥaf al-ʿālam al-kā'in* was certainly written between 1120 and the early 1200s, therefore, there is good reason to think that it was written in the first thirty or so years after 1120.

Since the author of this tract obviously cannot have been St. Augustine of Hippo, we can only speculate as to his real identity. It is possible, of course, that this is a pseudonymous work, the name of Augustine having been attached to it—as to so many other medieval works—to give it greater authority. This would account for al-Qurṭubī's belief that it was written by the great African doctor of the Church. It is far from clear, however, that adding the name of St. Augustine to a treatise aimed primarily at Islam would

¹⁶² See al-Qurṭubī, p. 84.

¹⁶³ See al-Qurṭubī, p. 126; cf. P. Devillard, "Thèse sur al-Qurṭubī (introduction)," p. 16.

do much to increase its authority in the eyes of Muslims, even though the name and repute of Augustine were known outside Christendom in the Middle Ages.¹⁶⁴ Furthermore, there is nothing in the fragments themselves to suggest that they were otherwise attributed to St. Augustine—all the glowing descriptions of this Aghushtīn are made by al-Qurṭubī.

It is more likely, therefore, that this tract was simply written by a contemporary Mozarab named Agustín (the Arabicized *Aghushtīn* obviously corresponds to the Castillian *Agustín* rather than the Latin *Augustinus*) and al-Qurṭubī merely assumed that this Agustín was the late-Antique theologian whose teachings were so important to the Latin church. In fact, the archival documents originating among the Toledan Mozarabs contain references to a priest named Aghushtīn who could well be our man. “So [the archbishop] placed this command on the [following] priests: *māyur*¹⁶⁵ Aghushtīn and *māyur* Andrā. . .” says the Arabic version of a bilingual account of the settlement of a land dispute dated 1121. The Latin version tells us in similar fashion that “Then [the archbishop] ordered the learned and prudent and faithful among the priests . . . and they are *dominus* Augustinus and *dominus* Andreas . . .”¹⁶⁶ Furthermore, there are also references to a learned Aghushtīn in al-Khazrajī’s *Maqāmi’ al-ṣulbān*—written in the mid-1140s—where he is identified as a commentator on scripture (*mufasssir*).¹⁶⁷ Either of these Aghushtīns (who could well be the same person, of course), as educated members of the Mozarabic community, could easily be the author of the *Maṣḥaf al-‘ālam al-kā’in*. Neither of course, is identified as a bishop, as our Aghushtīn is, but these references may date from before this

¹⁶⁴ See B. Blumenkranz, “Augustin et les Juifs,” pp. 240-41 where medieval Jewish familiarity with Augustine’s thought is discussed.

¹⁶⁵ I. e. *mayor*, meaning “lord”; this Arabicized Latin title was used as an equivalent to *dominus* in the Arabic archival documents of Toledo. See A. González-Palencia, *Los mozárabes de Toledo, Volumen preliminar*, p. 125.

¹⁶⁶ See A. González-Palencia, *Los mozárabes de Toledo* 3, pp. 300-301, doc. # 966; cf. F. Hernández, *Los cartularios de Toledo*, document 21, pp. 24-25.

¹⁶⁷ See al-Khazrajī 32, 37, pp. 60, 64; cf. Kh. Samir, “Review,” p. 252, and A. Charfi’s introduction to al-Khazrajī, pp. 16-17.

Aghushtīn became a bishop, or, al-Qurṭubī could have been misinformed about that too, since none of the fragments themselves tell us that their author was a bishop.

We have no indications in the fragments that this Aghushtīn was a *converso* Jew, as was the author of *Tathlīth al-waḥdāntyah*. Rather, especially if our Aghushtīn is the same as one or the other of the Aghushtīns mentioned in the archival documents and al-Khazrajī's treatise, he would seem to have been a Mozarab of considerable learning in both the Latin and Arabic traditions, who lived roughly in the first half of the twelfth century.

*The Annotator of Robert of Ketton's
Translation of the Qur'ān*

In addition to the previous four apologetic treatises, there is one other major source for our knowledge of how eleventh- and twelfth-century Mozarabs approached Islam intellectually, but it is of a rather different nature. It consists of a series of marginal annotations in the original manuscript of the well-known collection of works translated from Arabic into Latin under the auspices of Peter the Venerable in the early 1140's. This important manuscript (Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, MS lat. 1162) and the absolutely central role played by its contents in the spread of knowledge about Islam in Europe have been thoroughly discussed elsewhere;¹⁶⁸ and although the collection as a whole represents the concerted effort of several native and foreign-born Arabic-speaking Christians to translate important Arabic works into Latin, it is this series of annotations on the manuscript itself which gives us the best opportunity to catch a glimpse of Mozarabs in the process of learning about and refuting Islam. For while the works that make up the collection are all translations, the annotations are the fruit of much study of the texts of Islam and reflection on their implications.

¹⁶⁸ The most important references are M.-Th. d'Alverny, "Deux traductions," pp. 77-109; N. Daniel, *Islam and the West*, (see index under "Cluniac collection"); and J. Kritzeck, *Peter the Venerable and Islam*, passim.

The great majority of these annotations are found in the first ten folios of Robert of Ketton's translation of the Qur'ān (fols. 26-36), though there are scattered notes elsewhere in the manuscript. It must be admitted right away that many of these notes are interesting only as examples of how foolish and repugnant twelfth-century Christian intellectuals found the doctrines of Islam and the style and content of the Qur'ān. "Notice how stupidly and how often he repeats this," the Annotator remarks in the margin next to one Qur'ānic exhortation (2:179).¹⁶⁹ Frequently he ridicules the apparent contradictions of the Qur'ān: "He (i. e. Muḥammad) says that his religion is the religion of the Creator, and notice how contradictory he is to himself since he said just above that the Christian and Jew are able to be saved by their own religions."¹⁷⁰ He often concludes that Muḥammad must have spoken in delirium,¹⁷¹ or merely repeated the doctrines of the ancient heretics: "Notice that everywhere he promises a paradise . . . of carnal delights," just as other heretics did.¹⁷²

But there is much more to these marginal annotations than sterile ridicule. Sometimes this Annotator recasts the translation in order to clarify it.¹⁷³ Sometimes he attempts to explain the difficult style of the Qur'ān, such as when he suggests that a certain peculiar passage is only an "aside of God to Muḥammad" (*dei apostrofa ad Mahumet*),¹⁷⁴ or when he points out that much of the text must be understood as God's words spoken through Muḥammad's mouth.¹⁷⁵ Occasionally he explains transliterated Arabic words in the Latin text: "*Almuharum* (i. e. *al-muḥarram*)

¹⁶⁹ "Nota quam stulte et quotiens repetit istud" (Annotator, fol. 30ra, rm, c. ll. 5-8).

¹⁷⁰ "Legem suam dicit legem creatoris et nota quam contrarius sit sibi cum superius dixerit christianum et iudeum legibus suis posse saluari" (Annotator, fol. 28va, lm, c. ll. 22-25).

¹⁷¹ E. g., "Quando enim hic apostata predicare sua deliramenta cepit. . ." (Annotator, fol. 29va, lm, c. ll. 4-5).

¹⁷² "Nota quia talem paradysum ubique promittit scilicet carnalium deliciarum quae fuit olim alia heresis" (Annotator, fol. 26rb, rm, c. ll. 11-13).

¹⁷³ E. g. on fol. 29ra, rm, c. ll. 29-35.

¹⁷⁴ Annotator, fol. 27va, lm, c. ll. 7-8; the verse in question is 2:135; cf. 29ra, rm, c. ll. 4-5.

¹⁷⁵ E. g.: "Hic pluraliter deum loqui facit," and "Hic facit deum loqui ad iudeos" (Annotator, fol. 26va, lm, c. ll. 12, 28).

is the first month of the Arab year.”¹⁷⁶ Such notes as these make clear that the Annotator knows Arabic and is familiar with the Qur’ān, as does his correct observation that sūrah two is called “The Cow” because a cow is mentioned once in the text.¹⁷⁷

Often his notes betray a knowledge of important Islamic teachings as well, such as when he describes the Islamic belief that the revelation to Muḥammad was the same as the revelation to Jesus, Moses, and Abraham before him,¹⁷⁸ or when he observes that Muḥammad’s revelation was given “because Jews and Christians had abandoned their law.”¹⁷⁹ A similarly accurate understanding of Islam and its relation to other religions appears in his observation that,

[Muḥammad] speaks always to three kinds of men—that is, either to the Jews or the Christians or the idolators—so that, having abandoned that [religion] which they previously embraced, they should submit to [Islam] which he says is the last of all religions, and better than all [religions].¹⁸⁰

He is aware of the doctrine of the “literal illiterateness” of Muḥammad,¹⁸¹ and familiar with the Islamic claim that Muḥammad’s coming was foretold in the Bible.¹⁸² At points his

¹⁷⁶ “Almuharum est primus mensis anni arabum” (Annotator, fol. 30va, lm, c. l. 24).

¹⁷⁷ “Ecce fabula de uacca pro qua totum capitulum *azoara de boue* uocauit” (Annotator, fol. 27rb, rm, c. ll. 15-18).

¹⁷⁸ Annotator, fol. 28vb, lm, c. ll. 1-14, on v. 2:125ff.

¹⁷⁹ “Hic uult dicere quod ideo lex eius data sit quia iudei et christiani suam legem relinquerant” (Annotator, fol. 28rb, rm, c. ll. 4-6, on v. 2:105-06).

¹⁸⁰ “Sciendum uero est quod tribus generibus hominum semper loquitur—aut iudeis scilicet aut christianis aut idolatris—ut relicto eo quod ante tenebant legem istam suscipiant quam dicit omnium legum ultimam et omnibus esse meliorem” (Annotator, fol. 26va, lm, c. ll. 32-35).

¹⁸¹ “Dicit se legendi scribendique nescium ut eo magis credatur alchoran ei deum misisse nec a se fictum fuisse [He says that he does not know how to read and write so that it would be believed more completely that God had sent the Qur’ān to him and that it was not fashioned by him.]” (Annotator, fol. 57rb, rm, c. ll. 1-4).

¹⁸² “Dicit etiam pestifer iste quod nomen eius et in Ucteri Testamento et in Euangelio scriptum sit, sicut uidelicet dixerat Manicheus quod ipse esset paraclitus a Christo in Euangelio premissus [This malicious man says that his name is written in both the Old Testament and the Gospel, just as the Manichean [i. e. Mani] plainly had said that he was the Paraclete sent by Christ in the Gospel]” (Annotator, fol. 57rb, rm, c. ll. 23-28).

understanding of the inner logic of Islam is remarkable indeed: "[Muḥammad] calls [Jesus] the son of Mary in order that He in no way be believed to be the Son of God."¹⁸³

All these examples demonstrate the Annotator's familiarity with Islam and its Book, but what is particularly notable about these annotations is something that has gone unnoticed in the modern scholarship regarding them: that a significant minority of these marginal annotations incorporate information directly from Qur'ānic commentaries. This indicates that the Annotator had such a Qur'ānic *tafsīr* open next to him as he annotated Robert's translation of the Qur'ān. His use of this material will be discussed in detail in chapter four of this study, but it is worth noting here that he has frequently followed the model of the Qur'ānic commentaries, explaining ambiguous terms and listing the various theories regarding the occasion of revelation for certain verses; thus he has effectively made his annotations into a polemical Christian *tafsīr* on the first Latin version of the Qur'ān.

Who was this anonymous annotator and when did he annotate the manuscript? I have purposely delayed addressing this issue until after examining the nature of his annotations, because they are the best clue as to his identity. There is little doubt on paleographical grounds that the annotations are more or less contemporary with the compilation of the manuscript itself; this places them sometime in the 1140's.¹⁸⁴ Determining the identity of the author presents greater difficulties, however. D'Alverny believed that the Annotator was Peter the Venerable's able secretary, Peter of Poitiers; though not an Arabist, Peter of Poitiers had—she believed—sufficient curiosity and acumen to have gathered together the traditional interpretations of the Qur'ān used in these verses with the help, perhaps, of the translators Robert of Ketton and the Mozarab Peter of Toledo.¹⁸⁵ Two facts pointed to d'Alverny's conclusion: in one note the Annotator appears to

¹⁸³ "Illum. . . filium marie dicit ut nullo modo dei filius esse credatur" (Annotator, fol. 27vb, lm, c. ll. 20-23, on v. 2:87ff); cf. the similar comments on 48vb, lm, c. ll. 4-26.

¹⁸⁴ M.-Th. d'Alverny, "Deux traductions," p. 103, n. 2.

¹⁸⁵ Ibid., p. 103.

express great pride in the orthodoxy of the Latin Church,¹⁸⁶ while in another he gives a false etymology of the Arabic word *sūrah* (Lat. *azoara*) which is the name for a Qur'ānic chapter: the Annotator, she pointed out, confused *sūrah* with another similar word, *ṣūrah* which means "image," "form" or "likeness".¹⁸⁷ Both Daniel and Kritzeck have discounted this view, the former arguing that internal evidence (which he did not cite) indicated that the Annotator had to be a Mozarab,¹⁸⁸ the latter arguing that the translator Peter of Toledo, given his Mozarabic background, was the only one capable of writing these insightful annotations, though he suggested that the mysterious Muslim Muḥammad, who was part of the Peter the Venerable's translation team, may have helped him.¹⁸⁹

Although I do not find her argument based on the Annotator's pride in the Latin Church convincing—Mozarabs were, after all, Latin Christians, despite their Arabic language and customs—d'Alverny is surely right in seeing the compilation of these annotations as a team affair. Not only does the evidence which she cites suggest this, but there is further evidence to support her theory. At one point, for example, the Annotator attempts to explain the meaning of three Arabic words transliterated in the Latin text. *Rageb* (i. e., *rajab*), he observes, is the second month of the Islamic year, while *dulehega* (*dhū al-ḥijja*) is the eleventh, and *dulchada* (*dhū al-qā'dah*) the twelfth. This would all be very useful were it only correct. Unfortunately, *rajab* is the seventh month, and the latter two should be reversed.¹⁹⁰ Within the same series of annotations, therefore, we have commentary that clearly was composed by someone very much at home in Islamic civiliza-

¹⁸⁶ The note suggests that God taught the Latins the correct path (*uiam rectam*) so that whoever opposes them are liars. Therefore, Muḥammad spoke against the Latins especially "because beyond all nations the Latins are purer and truer Christians (*eo quod ultra omnes gentes latini puriores et ueriores christiani sunt*)" (Annotator, fol. 77vb, lm, c. ll. 16-25; cf. M.-Th. d'Alverny, "Deux traductions," p. 102).

¹⁸⁷ M.-Th. d'Alverny, "Deux traductions," p. 102.

¹⁸⁸ N. Daniel, *Islam and the West*, pp. 399-400.

¹⁸⁹ J. Kritzeck, *Peter the Venerable*, pp. 57-58, n. 31.

¹⁹⁰ Annotator, fol. 30va, lm, c. ll. 25-27.

tion and familiar with the basic Islamic religious texts, intermingled with annotations containing embarrassing errors such as an outsider like Peter of Poitiers might have made.

The only explanation for this curious situation is the one proposed by d'Alverny: Peter of Poitiers (or some other Latin Christian) compiled the notes with the help of such Arabic-speaking Christians as Robert of Ketton and Peter of Toledo. Though the notes were composed by a team, therefore, for the sake of convenience I will continue the custom of referring to their authors collectively as the Annotator. This collectively written commentary, it should be noted, is still further evidence of the cosmopolitanism of the eleventh- and twelfth-century Mozarabic intellectual milieu which I described in the last chapter. The other main sources used here exemplify this cosmopolitanism in various ways too, of course,—*Liber denudationis* being written by a converted Muslim perhaps, *Tathlith al-wahdānīyah* by a *converso* Jew, and *The Letter of al-Qūṭī* and the fragments of Aghushtīn by Mozarabs—but in this polemical Qur'ānic commentary we have striking evidence of Arabic-speaking Christians of very different backgrounds actually working closely with each other.

Supplemental Sources

These five fundamental sources can be supplemented in various ways by a handful of other sources which tangentially give us insight into how Mozarabs approached Islam. The first of these is the extraordinary refutation of Christianity which Ibn Ḥazm of Cordoba (994-1064) included in his immense encyclopedia of religions, *al-Faṣl fī al-mīlāl wa-al-ahwā' wa-al-nihāl*.¹⁹¹ Scattered passages of this refutation allow us to glimpse Mozarabs in contact intellectually with Islam at the very beginning of the period under

¹⁹¹ Ibn Ḥazm, *al-Faṣl*, 1:109-32, 2:13-217. For bibliography on this part of the *al-Faṣl* see "Ibn Ḥazm," *El²* 3:790-99 [art. R. Arnaldez]; M. de Epalza, "Notes pour une histoire des polémiques anti-chrétiennes," pp. 100-101; Id., *La Tuhfa*, pp. 67-68; G. Anawati, "Polémique, apologie et dialogue Islamo-chrétiens," pp. 400-01; and *Bibliographie* 21. 7, *Islamochristiana* 2 (1976):198.

consideration. These glimpses, however, present certain difficulties of their own. Although Ibn Ḥazm displays a profound knowledge of Christianity in this work, it is, as David Wasserstein has put it, an almost thoroughly “bookish knowledge” based very heavily on Oriental Arabic sources and, through the mediation of translations, earlier Latin sources.¹⁹² When he quotes an Arabic version of the Creed lacking the *filioque* clause and therefore almost surely of Oriental-Christian origin,¹⁹³ and when he describes the divisions of the Church and only mentions those known in the Orient—the Melkites, Nestorians, and Jacobites—leaving out any mention of the important Spanish heresies such as Adoptionism,¹⁹⁴ the bookishness of knowledge of Christianity is quite palpable. Surprisingly enough, however, this very bookishness turns out to be useful to us, since the abundant evidence Ibn Ḥazm thus provides of the circulation of Oriental Arab-Christian apologetic and theology in the Peninsula is very valuable to this study.

More importantly, however, it is not quite accurate to say that Ibn Ḥazm tells us nothing about the contemporary Mozarabs who lived in many of the cities which he frequented.¹⁹⁵ First of all, he explicitly says on several occasions that he has talked over certain Christian doctrines with contemporary Christians. For example, he remarks that a contemporary Christian has told him that the explanation for the difference between Jesus’ genealogies in Matthew and Luke is that one is the genealogy by natural birth, while the other follows the line of inheritance by adoption. This, as Asín-Palacios noted many years ago, is the traditional Augustinian explanation for this discrepancy, and is, therefore, just the sort of thing we would expect a Mozarab to say.¹⁹⁶

¹⁹² See D. Wasserstein, *The Rise and Fall of the Party Kings*, p. 239; cf. D. Urvoy, “La pensée religieuse des Mozarabes,” pp. 419, D. Urvoy, *Pensiers d’al-Andalus*, p. 44, and M. Asín-Palacios, *Abenházam de Córdoba* 2:42-46.

¹⁹³ See Ibn Ḥazm, *al-Faṣl* 1:118; M. Asín-Palacios, *Abenházam de Córdoba* 2:159-60; cf. A. Palmieri, “Filioque,” DTC 5/2:2309-12.

¹⁹⁴ See Ibn Ḥazm, *al-Faṣl* 1:109-11; M. Asín-Palacios, *Abenházam de Córdoba* 2:149-53. This description of the divisions of Christianity is found throughout the writings of Muslim heresiographers in the East; see R. Caspar, *Traité de théologie musulmane* 1, p. 5.

¹⁹⁵ As both D. Wasserstein and D. Urvoy imply; see n. 192 just above.

¹⁹⁶ See Ibn Ḥazm, *al-Faṣl* 2:33-34; M. Asín-Palacios, *Abenházam de*

Moreover, Ibn Ḥazm frequently mentions hypothetical statements which he believes a Christian might make in response to his own arguments. Some of these clearly have no relation to the views of any Christians, East or West, such as when he suggests that one can argue effectively against Christians by asking if the Word (as mentioned in the Gospel of John) is the Father or the Son or the Holy Spirit or some fourth thing. If they say some fourth thing, he observes, then they have added another person to the Trinity and contradicted their teaching.¹⁹⁷ Such a statement was almost certainly never made by any Christian. But sometimes, as we will see particularly in chapters three and four of this study, these statements placed hypothetically in the mouths of Christians reflect rather accurately the apologetic positions taken by Mozarabs in the main sources of this study. In these cases, Ibn Ḥazm's piecemeal statements about what Christians believe and how they defend themselves, taken in conjunction with similar arguments and observations found in later Mozarabic sources, do in fact allow us to glimpse mid-eleventh-century Mozarabs engaged intellectually with Islam.

Abū al-Walīd al-Bājī's so-called "Response to the Letter of the Monk of France" is a second supplemental source.¹⁹⁸ Al-Bājī (d. 1081) wrote this treatise near the time of his death in response to a short apologetic and polemical letter, which purports to have been written by a French monk (*al-rāhib min lfransah*) and sent to the Taifa ruler of Zaragoza, al-Muqtadir.¹⁹⁹ The monk's letter, at least as it stands, is almost surely inauthentic, as Abdelmagid Turki has shown;²⁰⁰ even if it were, since it originated in France

Córdoba 3:28-29, see esp. n. 39.

¹⁹⁷ Ibn Ḥazm, *al-Faṣl* 1:118-19, M. Asín-Palacios, *Abenházam de Córdoba* 2:160.

¹⁹⁸ See C. Brockelmann, *Geschichte der arabischen Literatur* 1, p. 534, S. 1, 743-44; M. de Epalza, "Notes pour une histoire des polémiques anti-chrétiennes," pp. 101-02; Id., *La Tuhfa*, pp. 68-69; *Bibliographie* 21.8, *Islamochristiana* 2 (1976):198-99.

¹⁹⁹ See A. Turki's edition and translation, "La lettre du «Moine de France»,» p. 84. D. Dunlop also edited both the letter and the response in "A Christian Mission to Muslim Spain," pp. 259-310.

²⁰⁰ See A. Turki, *Ibid.*, pp. 79-81.

and not among the Mozarabs, it has no relevance to this study. The response of al-Bāḥī, however, since it was written in al-Andalus, does occasionally provide us with scraps of information which shed light on the main Mozarabic apologetic works. Like Ibn Ḥazm's refutation of Christianity, for example, this treatise contains evidence of the circulation of Oriental Arab-Christian works in al-Andalus.

Petrus Alfonsi's fifth dialogue against the Jews,²⁰¹ which actually is a refutation of Islam, likewise supplements the main sources of this study in various ways; Petrus, an Arabic-speaking *converso* Jew, must have been very much part of the Mozarabic milieu. As we have seen, Petrus was deeply conscious of having been "nurtured" among the Muslims, even though he had rejected their religion.²⁰² Unfortunately we know virtually nothing about his connections with the Mozarabic community in Toledo, and little enough about his life in general.²⁰³ Nevertheless, Petrus' refutation of Islam, written about 1108 or 1110,²⁰⁴ is very similar in many respects to *Liber denudationis* and other, similar works originating in the Mozarabic milieu. What renders it of only marginal use to this study, however, is the fact that, as Professor van Koningsveld has shown, it is almost completely derivative of

²⁰¹ Petrus Alfonsi, *Dialogi contra Iudaeos* 5 (*De Sarracenorum lege destruenda, et sententiarum suarum stultiitia confutanda*), PL 157:597-606. On this portion of his famous work see N. Daniel, *Islam and the West*, p. 7 and see his index under "Pedro de Alfonso," M.-Th. d'Alverny, "La connaissance," pp. 593-95, P. van Koningsveld, "La apología de al-Kindī," pp. 111-21, and J. Tolan, *Petrus Alfonsi*, passim.

²⁰² See the Introduction to this study above.

²⁰³ Here see Tolan, *Petrus Alfonsi*, pp. 9-12. There has, in fact, been considerable ink spilled in attempting to demonstrate that Petrus was in Toledo during his life, that he was, in fact, identical with Peter of Toledo, the translator of the *Apology of al-Kindī* (about which more in the following chapter), and that he may even have been the author of the annotations discussed just above; see U. Monneret de Villard, *Lo studio dell' Islam*, p. 14; and esp. the eccentric work of A. Cutler, *The Jew as Ally of the Muslim*, pp. 57-80. While none of these possibilities can be ruled out, there is not sufficient evidence to justify any of them; here I agree with the more cautious judgements of J. Kritzeck, *Peter the Venerable and Islam*, p. 56, P. van Koningsveld, "La apología de al-Kindī," pp. 127-29, and J. Tolan, *Petrus Alfonsi*, p. 210.

²⁰⁴ See J. Tolan, *Petrus Alfonsi*, p. 10.

the famous Oriental-Christian *Apology of al-Kindī*.²⁰⁵ Though this fact in itself is important—it vividly illustrates how important Oriental Arab-Christian models were to twelfth-century Mozarabic polemic—it necessarily makes Petrus' fifth dialogue less interesting for our purposes than are other works such as *Liber denudationis* and the observations of the Annotator which were based on a variety of Arabic sources.

Finally al-Qurṭubī's lengthy refutation of *Taḥlīth al-waḥdānīyah*, in addition to preserving fragments of Aghushtīn's *Maṣḥaf al-ʿālam al-kā'in*, also preserves fragments of still other apologetic and polemical works written by Arabic-speaking Christians. I have already mentioned the fragmentary work attributed to Ḥafṣ ibn Albar.²⁰⁶ This treatise provides us with valuable insight into how ninth-century Arabicized Christians in Spain thought about and responded intellectually to Islam, and information of this kind will be valuable on more than one occasion in this study. This Arabic speaking son of Paulus Alvarus, for example, was already translating characteristically Latin-Christian ideas into Arabic in the mid-ninth century, something we will see Mozarabs doing in the twelfth. Al-Qurṭubī also quotes fragments from a Christian apologetic work which he calls *Kitāb al-ḥurūf* (*The Book of Letters*).²⁰⁷ Unfortunately, I have found nothing in these fragments that allows them to be dated. Neither is there any internal evidence which conclusively indicates the part of the Islamic world in which these anonymous fragments was written. Their author's use of a very typical Oriental-Christian triad of attributes to explain the Trinity—the Father as Substance (*jawhar*) or Essence (*dhāt*), the Son as Word (*nuṭq*), and the Holy Spirit as Life (*ḥayāh*)—suggests that it may, in fact, be a fragmentary Oriental-Christian work which circulated in Spain.²⁰⁸ In any case, these fragments certainly show many signs of Oriental-

²⁰⁵ See P. van Koningsveld, "Petrus Alfonsi, een 12de eeuwse schakel tussen islam en christendom in Spanje," pp. 127-46; and P. van Koningsveld, "La apología de al-Kindī," p. 115, n. 18.

²⁰⁶ See the beginning of this chapter.

²⁰⁷ Al-Qurṭubī quotes from this work on pp. 75, 79-80, 448.

²⁰⁸ See R. Haddad, *La Trinité divine*, pp. 214-18, 233.

Christian influence, whether or not they were actually written in the East, and they therefore provide us with valuable evidence of the circulation of Oriental Arab-Christian ideas among the Mozarabs of Spain.

*

These, then, are the religious polemical treatises, annotations, and fragments which, by indicating to us how eleventh- and twelfth-century Mozarabs approached Islam, allow us to see into their cultural milieu—to discover what books they read and to piece together some idea of how they used what they read. Altogether these often brief or fragmentary works add up to some eighty-five pages of Latin and Arabic text—by no means an enormous corpus of literature. All of this body of religious polemic and apologetic, however, can be fairly confidently attributed to Mozarabs (whether so-called Neo-Mozarabs, or New Mozarabs, or *converso* Jews, or descendants of the original Romano-Gothic Christians of Iberia) living in the later eleventh and twelfth centuries. And, moreover, this collection of works—small though it be—is pregnant with references, arguments, usages, and quotations which allow us to come to certain fairly solid conclusions regarding what sort of books circulated among them.

As Arabic-speaking Latin Christians raised among Muslims in or near al-Andalus, the Mozarabs were naturally familiar with three different (if not always completely distinct) cultural and religious traditions: the Arab-Muslim tradition of al-Andalus; the Arab-Christian tradition which flourished within Islamic civilization but was—and is—obviously not identical with it; and the Latin-Christian tradition to which the Mozarabs' cultural and religious heritage connected them. What these religious-controversial works tell us about the intellectual history of the Mozarabs during the eleventh and twelfth centuries is that they were still deeply engaged in all three of these traditions. Each of the following three chapters, therefore, explores their engagement with one of these traditions as exemplified by their apologetic and polemical works.

CHAPTER THREE
THE ORIENTAL-CHRISTIAN CONTRIBUTION
TO MOZARABIC APOLOGETIC AND POLEMIC

When the authors of the *Letter of al-Qūṭī*, *Tathlith al-waḥdānīyah*, and *Liber denudationis* composed these tracts in the twelfth century, they were certainly not the first writers to use Arabic for Christian apologetic or theological purposes. Far from it. In the Middle East, a centuries-long tradition of Christian literature in Arabic had developed by this time. Not only were some of the pre-Islamic poets of Arabia Christians,¹ but very soon after the advent of Islam, Christian bishops in conquered areas were called upon to defend their faith in Arabic before Islamic rulers.² In the course of the seventh and eighth centuries, a sophisticated Christian-Arabic theological vocabulary was developed, and is much in evidence in the early ninth-century Christian works of, for example, Theodore Abū Qurrah and Ḥabīb ibn Khidmah.³ By the late ninth or early tenth century, an anonymous Christian in Baghdad had written the *Apology of al-Kindī*, arguably the greatest medieval Christian polemic against Islam, and certainly the most influential.⁴ In short, between roughly 750 and 1050 a substantial

¹ See L. Cheikho, *Shu‘arā’ al-Naṣrānīyah qabla al-islām*, and also C. Brockelmann, *Geschichte der arabischen Literatur* I, pp. 19-23, G. Graf, *Geschichte der christlichen arabischen Literatur* I, pp. 31-33, and Kh. Samir, “al-Turāth al-‘arabī al-Masīhī,” pp. 6-7 for more bibliography.

² See R. Haddad, *La Trinité divine*, pp. 26-28.

³ For editions of their works see *Bibliographie* 12. 6. and 12. 8., *Islamochristiana* 1 (1975):153-56; see also the recent edition of one of the latter’s most important works: Theodore Abū Qurrah, *Maymār fī wujūd al-khāliq wa-āḍin al-qawīm*, ed. I. Dick, (Beirut, 1986).

⁴ The bibliography on this work is substantial; on its role in the polemical tradition see G. Graf, “Christliche Polemik gegen den Islam,” pp. 828-29, G. Anawati, “Polémique, apologie et dialogue Islamo-chrétiens,” pp. 380-92, and A. Abel, “L’Apologie d’Al-Kindī et sa place dans la polémique Islamo-chrétienne,” *passim*; on its date of composition see “Al-Kindī, ‘Abd al-Masīh b. Ishāk,” *EI*² 5:120-21 [art. G. Troupeau], but cf. R. Haddad, *La Trinité divine*, p.

Arab-Christian theological and apologetic tradition had developed among Oriental Christians. This tradition, moreover, embraced dozens of writers who grappled with all the theological and apologetic problems which naturally arose within Christian communities living within Islam.⁵

Now we know that at least two important and widely read works representative of this tradition had made their way to Spain by the High Middle Ages, for the *Apology of al-Kindī* was translated in Toledo as part of the Cluniac Corpus in the early 1140's,⁶ while a late thirteenth- or early fourteenth-century Mozarabic manuscript containing a version of the late eighth-century disputation between the Nestorian Catholicos Timothy I and the Caliph al-Mahdī survived to this century in North Africa.⁷ There is some

42, who dates it earlier than most scholars (c. 836).

⁵ For recent bibliography on this tradition see *Bibliographie*, introduction, 12. & 22., *Islamochristiana* 1 (1975):125-42, 152-76, *Islamochristiana* 2 (1976):201-42, and R. Haddad, *La Trinité divine*, passim; see also G. Graf, *Geschichte der christlichen arabischen Literatur* 1 and 2 which, though in need of updating, are still extremely useful; Kh. Samir's "al-Turāth al-ʿarabī al-Masīhī," pp. 1-35, has some intriguing reflections on the mutual influences of the Arab-Islamic and Arab-Christian religious traditions.

⁶ See M.-Th. d'Alverny, "Deux traductions," pp. 87-98; and J. Kritzeck, *Peter the Venerable and Islam*, pp. 101-07. In a later article, d'Alverny observed—rightly, it seems to me—that the *Apology* had probably already been in Spain for some time before its translation into Latin; see M.-Th. d'Alverny, "La connaissance," p. 593.

⁷ This badly damaged manuscript was, as recently as 1962, in the mosque of Sīdī ʿUqbah in Kairouan, Tunisia, shelfmark 120/829, but on a recent trip to Tunisia, I discovered—with the gracious help of Professors Mourad Rammah, Abdelmajid Charfi, and Ibrahim Shabuh—that it has been moved to the National Museum of Tunisia in Raqqada where, lacking a shelfmark, it is known anecdotally as *Taʿrīkh Yarūnim*; it currently is not listed in that museum's catalogue. As Levi della Vida reported, the manuscript also contains another similar, anonymous Christian-Muslim disputation which has not yet been identified; see G. Levi della Vida, "I Mozarabi," p. 677, and id., "Un texte mozarabe d'histoire universelle," pp. 175-76. The disputation of Timothy and al-Mahdī was originally written in Syriac in the form of a letter addressed by Timothy to an anonymous correspondent; for bibliography on this Syriac version see R. Caspar "Les versions arabes du dialogue entre le Catholicos Timothée I et le Calife al-Mahdī," pp. 107-08, and *Bibliographie* 12. 5, *Islamochristiana* 1 (1975):153. There are at least three versions of the Arabic translation, of which Caspar in the article just cited published the earliest while Cheikho published the latest in *al-Mashriq* in 1921; since it has been necessary to refer to both of these versions, Caspar's edition has been cited as *al-Muḥāwarah al-dīniyah* 1, Cheikho's as *al-*

evidence, moreover, that still another very influential work of this tradition—the early ninth-century *Dialogue of Abraham the Tiberiad* with ‘*Abd al-Raḥmān al-Hāshimī*—circulated in Spain as well.⁸ Furthermore, there is a variety of other evidence of the circulation of Oriental Arab-Christian theological and apologetic works in Spain. The works of the ninth-century Latin Christians living in and around Córdoba were influenced by such Oriental-Christian works,⁹ while bishop Rabīʿ ibn Zayd may have modeled his famous tenth-century calendar on a similar calendar written by the Oriental-Christian physician Yūḥannā ibn Māsawayh.¹⁰ An anonymous Nestorian work of philosophical theology was a source for Baḥya ibn Paqūda’s important eleventh-century Jewish mystical work, *Duties of the Heart*.¹¹ Ibn Ḥazm quotes what is clearly an Oriental version of the Creed in his refutation of Christianity,¹² as well as a Trinitarian argument which is very similar to one propounded by the his near contemporary, the Nestorian bishop ʿĪlīyā al-Naṣībī (d. 1046).¹³ Presumably such Arabic treatises written by Middle-Eastern Christians were carried to Spain by Orien-

Muḥāwarah al-dīnīyah 2; see list of short titles and abbreviations at the beginning of this study. The version of the Tunisian ms. is different in certain ways from both these published versions, and may, therefore, be the second version of the work identified by Caspar.

⁸ See *Bibliographie* 12.11, *Islamochristiana* 1 (1975):157-58, edited and translated into French in G. Marcuzzo, *Le dialogue d'Abraham de Tibériade*, pp. 252-533. On the possibility that it circulated in Spain see B. Kedar, *Crusade and Mission*, p. 22, n. 45, and F. Franke, “Die freiwilligen Märtyrer von Cordova,” pp. 50-58. The extensive ms. tradition—thirty-three extant mss. (see Marcuzzo, *ibid.*, pp. 169ff.)—indicates that like the dialogue of Timothy and the *Apology of al-Kindī* this was a very popular work (cf. R. Haddad, *La Trinité divine*, p. 32).

⁹ See R. Schwinges, *Kreuzzugsideologie und Toleranz*, pp. 86-88, who is heavily influenced by F. Franke, “Die freiwilligen Märtyrer von Cordova,” 47-67.

¹⁰ See P. van Koningsveld, “La literatura cristiano-árabe,” pp. 702.

¹¹ See D. Urvoy, “La pensée religieuse des Mozarabes,” pp. 423-25. The work in question is *Kitāb al-dalāʾil wa-al-ʾiʿtibār ʿalā al-khalq wa-al-tadbīr*, often attributed to al-Jāḥiz, no ed., Cairo, 1987.

¹² See chapter two above, pp. 89-90.

¹³ See Ibn Ḥazm, *al-Faṣl* 1:114; M. Asín-Palacios, *Abenházam de Córdoba* 2:155; cf. ʿĪlīyā al-Naṣībī, “al-Majlis al-awwal,” pp. 77-79.

tal Christians such as the monk George of Mār Sābā monastery, who came to Spain at the time of the Cordoban Martyrs, or by such Mozarabic travellers as Recemundo who journeyed to Jerusalem and Constantinople and back in the mid-tenth century.¹⁴

Because of the existence of this long Arab-Christian theological and apologetic tradition in the Middle East, and because certain works representative of it were available in Spain, we should not be too surprised to discover that the Mozarabic polemical and apologetic works described in the previous chapter are redolent of influence by that Oriental Arab-Christian tradition. The Mozarabic apologists, in fact, wrote very much within the tradition already developed by their Middle Eastern coreligionists. This Oriental-Christian influence is clear first of all in the theological and religious vocabulary used by these Mozarabs in their Arabic writings; but it is likewise evident in many of the arguments used by the Mozarabs in both their Arabic and Latin works to refute the claims of Islam or to justify Christian doctrine. The task of this chapter will be to consider certain examples of both that Oriental vocabulary and these Oriental arguments in order to demonstrate this widespread Oriental-Christian influence. Since the *Apology*, Timothy's dialogue with al-Mahdī, and the *Dialogue of Abraham* all probably circulated in Spain, special attention will be paid to vocabulary and arguments they have in common with the Mozarabic works which are the focus of this study.

*

Other scholars have observed that the same Arabic word can mean very different things in the Middle Ages depending on whether it is used by a Christian or a Muslim.¹⁵ A good example is the word

¹⁴ On George see D. Millet-Gérard, *Chrétiens mozarabes et culture islamique*, pp. 154-5, 159-63, 166; d'Alverny notes that Mār Sābā was a center of anti-Islamic polemic, "La connaissance," p. 590, a view which has been expounded in much greater detail in G. Marcuzzo, *Le dialogue d'Abraham de Tibériade*, pp. 82-86.

¹⁵ R. Haddad, *La Trinité divine*, pp. 161-62; P. Khoury, *Matériaux pour servir à l'étude de la controverse théologique islamo-chrétienne* 1, pp. 6-7; L. Gardet, *L'Islam, religion et communauté*, p. 420.

ḥanīf which means “idolator” or “pagan” when used by a Christian, but is the epithet given to a believer in the perennially true and original monotheistic faith (Abraham, for example) when used by a Muslim.¹⁶ It is such differences of lexical usage along confessional lines—most of which are not so striking as this—which allow us to identify the influence of Oriental Arab-Christian theological vocabulary on the writings of the Mozarabs of Spain. As a few examples taken from the language of their Trinitarian theology will demonstrate, the Mozarabs used certain Arabic words with the specifically Christian meaning given to them by Oriental Christians.

The Melkites, Nestorians, and Jacobites of the Middle East developed several Arabic technical terms for “person” or “hypostasis” in the theological sense. The most common of these was *uqnūm* (pl. *aqānīm*) borrowed by way of Syriac from the Greek *oikonomos*.¹⁷ This “strictly Christian term” was developed in the East, as its etymology indicates, and it was used widely there before any of the eleventh- and twelfth-century Mozarabic treatises were written.¹⁸ It can be found, for example, with just this technical meaning of “person of the Trinity” in the *Apology of al-Kindī*, Timothy’s disputation with al-Mahdī, and the *Dialogue of Abraham*.¹⁹ One of the fragments of the *Book of Fifty-Seven Questions*, written probably by Ḥafṣ ibn Albar and preserved in al-Qurṭubī’s *al-Flām*, employs *uqnūm* with precisely this Christian meaning, thereby demonstrating its use by Mozarabs before 1050.²⁰ Not surprisingly, therefore, when al-Qūṭī refers to a per-

¹⁶ See “Ḥanīf,” EI² 3:165-66 [art. W. M. Watt]; as Watt points out here, the *Apology of al-Kindī* uses *ḥanīf* in exactly the Christian sense of “idolator;” see *Risālat al-Kindī*, p. 42, and cf. *Majālis Ibrāhīm* 103, G. Marcuzzo, *Le dialogue d’Abraham de Tibériade*, p. 319.

¹⁷ G. Graf, *Verzeichnis arabischer kirchlicher Termini*, p. 11; R. Haddad, *La Trinité divine*, p. 171.

¹⁸ R. Haddad, *La Trinité divine* pp. 170-72, 181.

¹⁹ “Allāh wāḥid dhū kalimah wa-rūḥ fī thalāthat aqānīm” (*Risālat al-Kindī*, p. 57); “Ka-dhālika al-ab wa-al-ibn wa-al-rūḥ thalāthat aqānīm jawhar wāḥid” (Ṭīmāthāwus, *al-Muḥāwarah al-dīnīyah* I, 10, p. 131); “taqūlūna inna Allāh thalāthat aqānīm” (*Majālis Ibrāhīm* 12, G. Marcuzzo, *Le dialogue d’Abraham de Tibériade* p. 269).

²⁰ “Bal anna uqnūm al-ab ghair uqnūm al-ibn wa-uqnūm al-ibn ghayr <uqnūm> al-rūḥ” (Ḥafṣ ibn Albar in al-Qurṭubī, p. 61).

son of the Trinity, he uses *uqnūm* too; though, as I pointed out in chapter two, he uses it with some imprecision, saying that God, the Son, and the Spirit are “three persons (*aqānīm*) [in] one person (*uqnūm*).”²¹ In the fragments written by the otherwise unknown Aghushtīn, the word is used in the same fashion: “And this is our teaching about the three persons (*aqānīm*). . .”²²

When the author of *Tathlīth al-wahdānīyah* refers to a person of the Trinity, however, he uses a different word, *khawāṣṣ* (pl. *khawāṣṣ*): “Rather we say that [He is] an eternal substance who exists ever in three persons (*khawāṣṣ*).”²³ Now although *khawāṣṣ* is a perfectly normal Arabic word which means “exclusive property,” or “characteristic,” or “essence,” Oriental Christians used it originally to refer to the specific property or *proprium* of each member of the Trinity,²⁴ a usage found in Timothy’s disputation with al-Mahdī.²⁵ Later by extension, or perhaps because of imprecision, Oriental Christians also used it in place of *uqnūm* to mean “hypostasis” or “person.”²⁶ It is not at all surprising, therefore, that we find the word with this second meaning in *Tathlīth al-wahdānīyah*. Here again, therefore, a Mozarab employed a theological term with just the meaning given to it earlier by Oriental Christians.

²¹ “Fa-āmin bi-Allāh wa-qul [bi-]al-Masīḥ. . . wa-bi-al-rūḥ thalāthat aqānīm uqnūm wāḥid” (al-Qūṭī in al-Khazrajī 2, p. 31).

²² “Wa-hādhā qawlunā fī al-aqānīm al-thalāthah. . .” (Aghushtīn in al-Qurṭubī, p. 60).

²³ “Wa-lākin naqūlu inna jawharan qadīm lam yazal mawjūdān bi-thalāth khawāṣṣ” (*Tathlīth al-wahdānīyah* in al-Qurṭubī, p. 77).

²⁴ For this meaning see G. Graf, *Verzeichnis arabischer kirchlicher Termini* p. 42, R. Haddad, *La Trinité divine* pp. 153-54, 178, and H. Wolfson, *The Philosophy of Kalam*, p. 120.

²⁵ Timothy notes that each of the three persons in the Trinity is different from the others because of its *proprium*: “Kull wāḥid . . . ghayr al-ākhar bi-khawāṣṣatihi” (Ṭīmāthāwus, *al-Muḥāwarah al-dīnīyah* I, 10, p. 130).

²⁶ Yahyā ibn ‘Adī, for example, uses the word in both these senses. In one of his short treatises he mentions “properties (*khawāṣṣ*) which determine the persons (*aqānīm*) of the Trinity,” while in the title of the same treatise he uses the two words interchangeably: “God is one substance possessing three persons (*khawāṣṣ*) which Christians call *aqānīm* (hypostases).” See A. Périer, ed., *Petits traités*, pp. 61, 44. R. Haddad discusses the widespread imprecision in the use of these terms in his *La Trinité divine*, pp. 178-81.

If the language employed by the Mozarabs with regard to the persons of the Trinity reflects this Oriental-Christian influence, so also does the language used to describe the substance of the God-head. When the author of *Tathlūth al-wahdāntyah* described God in the passage quoted just above as an “eternal substance,” the word he used for “substance” is *jawhar*.²⁷ This likewise is a perfectly common Arabic word (though of Persian derivation) which ordinarily refers either to a jewel or more generally to what we would call a material substance, something solid and bodily.²⁸ Nevertheless, it was also the standard Arabic philosophical term for substance, corresponding to the Greek *ousia* and the Latin *substantia*.²⁹ Medieval Muslim philosophers and religious thinkers, however, almost never said that God is a substance, so they rarely used *jawhar* to refer to Him;³⁰ but Arab Christians often did,³¹ defining *jawhar* not as a bodily or material substance, but rather as “a self-subsistent thing” (*al-qā'im bi-nafsihi*) as the eleventh-century Nestorian bishop ʿIlīyā al-Naṣībī put it.³² The *Apology of al-Kindī*, Timothy’s dialogue with al-Mahdī, and the *Dialogue of Abraham* use the term widely with respect to God,³³ and it can be

²⁷ *Tathlūth al-wahdāntyah* in al-Qurṭubī, p. 77: “*jawhar qadīm*”.

²⁸ For these meanings see E. Lane, *An Arabic-English Lexicon* 2, pp. 475c-76a, and R. Dozy, *Supplément* 1, p. 237a.

²⁹ For this meaning see “*djawhar*,” EI² 2:493-94 [art. S. van den Bergh], and P. Morewedge, *The Metaphysica of Avicenna*, p. 307.

³⁰ Here see “*djawhar*,” EI¹ 2:1028 [art. B. Carra de Vaux]; but also L. Gardet and G. Anawati, *Introduction à la théologie musulmane*, pp. 66, 155; E. Fackenheim, “‘Substance’ and ‘Perseity’ in Medieval Arabic Philosophy,” pp. 119-25; Morewedge, *The Metaphysica of Avicenna*, p. 309; R. Haddad, *La Trinité divine*, p. 140.

³¹ As, for example, Ibn Ḥazm points out; see E. Fackenheim, “‘Substance’ and ‘Perseity’ in Medieval Arabic Philosophy,” p. 119.

³² ʿIlīyā al-Naṣībī, “*al-Majlis al-awwal*,” p. 75, ll. 89, 92. G. Graf, *Verzeichnis arabischer kirchlicher Termini* p. 36, defines it as “Substanz, Wesen (in der Theologie).” For other examples of the usage of *jawhar* with respect to God see the Syrian Ḥabīb ibn Khidmah in his “*al-Risālah al-awwalah* (sic) fī al-thālūth al-muqaddas,” p. 11; and the Jacobite Yahya ibn ʿAdī in A. Periér, ed., *Petits traités*, pp. 22, 44 and passim.

³³ See *Risālāt al-Kindī*, pp. 51-57 *passim*, e. g. p. 54: “*Fa-ammā šifāt dhāt [Allāh]. . . fa-jawhar dhū kalimah wa-rūḥ*”; and *Majālis Ibrāhīm* 168, G. Marcuzzo, *Le dialogue d'Abraham de Tibériade* p. 349: “*Innamā naʿrifu Allāh bi-kalimatihī wa-rūḥihī jawharan wāḥidan*”; for Timothy see n. 19 of this chapter just above.

found in similar contexts in certain of the Christian texts cited by Ibn Ḥazm³⁴ and the other fragmentary Christian works cited by al-Qurṭubī.³⁵ As a result of the differences in how Muslims and Christians used the word, it is not uncommon to find that the use of *jawhar* with respect to God becomes a point of contention in religious disputations.³⁶ This is just what happened in the case of its use by the author of *Tathlīth al-waḥdāntyah*. When the Andalusī Muslim al-Qurṭubī refuted that Mozarabic polemicist's views about the Godhead, he pointed out that the common use of *jawhar* is to refer to "the body of a thing having surface extension and inevitably subject to movement and rest, and these are two signs of its changeability and temporality." Thus, he contended, anyone who described God as a *jawhar* is woefully in error.³⁷

³⁴ E. g. the Creed: "Nu'minu . . . bi-al-rabb al-wāḥid Yasū' al-Masīḥ . . . min jawhar Abīhi . . ." ("We believe . . . in one Lord, Jesus Christ . . . [part] of the substance of His father . . .") [Ibn Ḥazm, *al-Faṣl* 1:118, M. Asín-Palacios, *Abenḥázam de Córdoba* 2:159]).

³⁵ E. g. *Kutāb al-ḥurūf* in al-Qurṭubī, pp. 79-80.

³⁶ In one instance Ḥīyā al-Naṣībī explained that Christians only use this word in discussions with Muslims because they cannot find any other word in Arabic to express ideas originally expounded in Syriac, after which his Muslim friend willingly allows Ḥīyā to use *jawhar* with the technical Christian meaning of "a thing existing in itself (*al-qā'im bi-naṣihi*)." See "al-Majlis al-awwal," page and line numbers as cited in n. 32 just above; cf. R. Haddad, *La Trinité divine* p. 137. The typical Muslim distaste for the use of this term with respect to God is well illustrated by the fact that Ibn 'Arabī, in addition to all the other innovations he was later charged with, was said to have described God as a *jawhar*, and even to have taught that "the Creator . . . is a *jawhar* in three hypostases (*aqānīm*)." See al-Ḥusayn ibn al-Ahdal (d. 1451), *Kashf al-ghitā' 'an ḥaqā'iq al-tawḥīd wa-al-radd 'alā Ibn 'Arabī al-faylasūf al-ṣūfī*, ed. Aḥmad Bukayr Muḥammad (Tunis, 1964), p. 190. I thank my friend and former colleague, Professor Alexander Knysh, for this reference.

³⁷ "Wa-lafẓ "al-jawhar" . . . huwa al-jirm al-shāghil qadran min al-misāḥah wa-lā budd la-hu min al-ḥarakah wa-al-sukūn wa-humā dalīlā taghyīrihi wa-ḥudūthihi" (al-Qurṭubī, p. 78). Later in his rebuttal, al-Qurṭubī categorically denies that God is a *jawhar*: "Fa-laysa [Allāh] bi-jism . . . wa-lā jawhar . . ." (ibid., p. 440). In his refutation of the so-called "Monk of France," al-Bāḥī provides still further evidence of the use of Oriental Arab-Christian theological vocabulary in Spain. Not only is he familiar with the terms *uqnūm* and *jawhar*, but he also uses such characteristically Oriental-Christian terms as *nāsūt* (=human nature) and *lāhūt* (=divine nature); see Abū al-Walīd al-Bāḥī, "Jawāb Abī al-Bāḥī 'alā risālat al-rāhib," in A. Turki, "La lettre du «Moine de France»" pp. 94, 102.

Two other peculiarly Oriental Arab-Christian usages found in these Mozarabic works point to the same sort of influence. Though Arab Christians frequently adopted the Muslim *basmalah*—"In the name of God the Merciful, the Compassionate"—as their own, affixing it, as Muslims did and do, to the beginning of written works of many kinds,³⁸ Oriental Arab Christians also invented a Trinitized *basmalah* of their own which they used in much the same way: "In the name of Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, One God."³⁹ Now as Rachid Haddad has pointed out, this Trinitarian *basmalah* is fundamentally different from the similar Trinitarian invocations used by Christians in Greek, Syriac, or Latin, since it includes the words "One God" at the end to emphasize the monotheistic aspect of Trinitarian belief, this emphasis doubtless being an effort to make the Christian doctrine of God seem less unpalatable to Muslims.⁴⁰ This Christian *basmalah*, moreover, was used in the East as early as the eighth century, and its use among Arab Christians is still current. In the twelfth century, however, we also find it used prominently in Spain at the beginning of the *Letter of al-Qūṭī*: "In the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, One God."⁴¹

Likewise, Oriental Arab Christians frequently spoke of the first person of the Trinity as "Father" using a word of Syriac origin, *Āb* (with a long "a" vowel and written in consequence with a *mad-dah* over the *alif*), rather than the common though etymologically related Arabic word, *Ab* (with a short "a" vowel). This usage is found frequently, for example, in the *Dialogue of Abraham*.⁴² The

³⁸ See e. g. the *Risālat al-Kindī*, p. 38. The Mozarabic archival documents of Toledo likewise begin with this typically Islamic phrase; see A. González-Palencia, *Los mozárabes de Toledo, Volumen preliminar*, p. 43.

³⁹ E. g. the ninth-century Iraqi Christian 'Ammār al-Baṣrī at the beginning of his *Kitāb al-masā'il wa-al-ajwibah*, p. 93 (Arabic): "Bi-ism al-Āb (sic) wa-al-lbn wa-al-Rūḥ al-Qudus Allāh al-wāḥid."

⁴⁰ See R. Haddad, *La Trinité divine*, p. 252.

⁴¹ "Bi-ism al-Ab wa-al-lbn wa-al-Rūḥ al-Qudus Ilāh wāḥid" (al-Qūṭī in al-Khazrajī 2, p. 30).

⁴² See e. g. *Majālis Ibrāhīm* 166, G. Marcuzzo, *Le dialogue d'Abraham de Tibériade* p. 349, and see lexical index p. 543. On the origin of this word see Marcuzzo's commentary on p. 348, n. 18; cf. R. Blanchère, et al. *Dictionnaire Arabe-Français-Anglais* 1 (Paris, 1967), p. 18. For another example see the passage from 'Ammār al-Baṣrī quoted in n. 39 just above.

Mozarabs Ḥaḥṣ ibn Albar, Aghushtīn, and the author of the *Tathlīth al-waḥdānīyah* all adopt this custom quite enthusiastically, using the originally Syriac *Āb* to refer to God as “Father.”⁴³

*

These examples make clear that Mozarabs had familiarity with Oriental-Christian theological vocabulary, but Oriental influence is just as clear in the content of the Mozarabic works. There is, first of all, an overall thematic similarity between the Oriental-Christian and Mozarabic works. Paul Khoury has observed that Oriental Arab-Christian theologians and apologists organized their works around one or more of the following six themes: 1] that God is one substance in three persons, 2] that Jesus the Messiah is both God and man, 3] that the Christian scriptures are authentic and uncorrupted, 4] that Muḥammad was not a prophet, 5] that the Qur’ān is not revelation, and 6] that Islam is a religion of lax morality.⁴⁴ A quick glance at the contents of the eleventh- and twelfth-century Mozarabic treatises of interest here is enough to see that they all fit within this same schema. Al-Qūṭī’s letter, for example, briefly takes up four of these six themes—arguing that Jesus is the divine Son of God, attacking Islam’s lax marriage laws, pointing out erroneous statements in the Qur’ān, and asserting the validity of the Christian scriptures against the Muslim accusation that they have been distorted. The anonymous *Tathlīth al-waḥdānīyah*, on the other hand, focuses in some detail on just three—demonstrating the validity of the Trinity in a rather rationalistic way, arguing in favor of Jesus’ divinity on the basis of the Qur’ān, and defending the Incarnation by an appeal to both

⁴³ For Ḥaḥṣ see al-Qurṭubī, p. 80; for Aghushtīn see *ibid.*, p. 83; for *Tathlīth al-waḥdānīyah* see *ibid.*, p. 63. Al-Qurṭubī himself uses the form in his rebuttal of Christian beliefs (see p. 92). Like Oriental Arab-Christians, the Andalusī writers also occasionally use the standard Arabic form; see *ibid.*, p. 63.

⁴⁴ P. Khoury, *Matériaux pour servir à l’étude de la controverse théologique islamo-chrétienne* 1, p. 19.

the Christian *and* Muslim scriptures.⁴⁵ Likewise, the other Mozarabic works are informed by one or more of these same six themes, the *Liber denudationis* treating all six in considerable detail.⁴⁶

This general thematic similarity, however, may not arise merely from imitation on the part of Mozarabs, since these six themes represent the basic concerns that any educated Christian of the Middle Ages might have had when confronted with the claims of Islam. What is far more instructive for our purposes is to notice how often the Mozarabic writers follow the Oriental writers in their basic argumentative approach to these six themes. Time and again we find the Mozarabs trotting out essentially the same arguments as those used earlier by Oriental Christians, often citing the same Qur'anic and Biblical proof-texts, and resorting to the same metaphors. Not that the Mozarabs simply copy unimaginatively what they find in the writings of Oriental Christians. Frequently—and this will become clearer in the following two chapters—they considerably rework ideas and approaches which they have learned from Oriental Christians. But even in reworking old arguments, the Mozarabs do not fundamentally alter them. As the following examples illustrate, this essential similarity of approach can be seen in a wide variety of arguments.

In order to besmirch Muḥammad's character, the *Apology* made an example out of the story of Zayd and Zaynab by quoting the whole of verse 33:37, which describes how the Prophet was married by God to Zaynab after Zayd had repudiated her.⁴⁷ "All men of understanding will find a sufficient example from this story," the author observes in closing, assuming that his Christian audience will be shocked merely by the quotation of the verses.⁴⁸ Petrus Alphonsi took the same line, observing that Muḥammad, as the incident of Zayd and Zaynab shows, "was not ashamed to dis-

⁴⁵ Though other of the themes are mentioned in passing; see the description of the contents of these two works above in chapter two.

⁴⁶ On *Liber denudationis* see the end of this chapter.

⁴⁷ *Risālat al-Kindī*, pp. 81-82.

⁴⁸ "Wa-yaktafī kull dhū 'aql min al-qīṣṣah bi-namūdḥaj" (*Risālat al-Kindī*, p. 82).

grace another's marriage by adultery as if God were commanding it."⁴⁹ The author of the *Liber denudationis* made much indeed of this incident, citing not only the Qur'ānic verses in question, but also certain ḥadīths from Qur'ānic commentaries which amplify the story, topping it all off with his own embellishments in order to make it sound both as licentious and as foolish as possible: "Upon seeing Zeid's wife," he notes, "Muḥammad was amazed;" and when Zayd consented to divorce Zaynab, "Muḥammad was joyful beyond measure, and he fell on his face."⁵⁰ Both Petrus and the *Liber denudationis*, therefore, used the story of Zayd and Zaynab in exactly the way the Oriental *Apology* had used it: as an example of Muḥammad's lustful character and of how he concocted (in their view) Qur'ānic verses to justify it.⁵¹

Similarly, several of our sources describe certain features of the Islamic marriage laws in order to expose what they saw as the loose morals of Islam. For example, once a man has formally divorced his wife by uttering the declaration of divorce (*ṭalāq*) three times, Islamic law forbids a remarriage between these same spouses unless the wife has entered into and dissolved a marriage with another man.⁵² Citing part of verse 2:230, the *Letter of al-Qūṭl* observed that Muḥammad required that "when a man divorces a woman three times 'she is not free for him until she marries a husband other than him,'" even though the Torah forbade the remarriage of the same spouses after the woman had married another man.⁵³ *Tathlith al-waḥdāniyah*'s author described

⁴⁹ "Alienum thorum foedare adulterio tanquam Domino praecipiente non erubesceret" (*Dialogus* 5, PL 157:601c).

⁵⁰ "Ad uisionem vxoris Zeid . . . obstupuit Machometus" (cf. the ḥadīth cited by al-Ṭabarī which notes that Zaynab's beauty "aroused admiration in (*a'jabat*)" the Prophet; see commentary to *Liber denudationis* 7.10); "Audiens haec Machometus gausus est nimis et cecidit in faciem" (*Liber denudationis* 7.9).

⁵¹ Such polemical use of this Qur'ānic incident was common in Spain from at least the ninth century, for the famous life of Muḥammad discovered by Eulogius contains the kernel of the arguments just described; see K. Wolf, "The Earliest Lives of Muḥammad," pp. 89-97.

⁵² N. Daniel, *Islam and the West*, p. 137.

⁵³ "al-Rajul idhā ṭallaqa imra'atahu thalāthan 'lā taḥillu la-hu ḥattā tankiḥa zawjan ghairahu'" (al-Qūṭl in al-Khazrajī 6, p. 35).

the same law, and then quoted a ḥadīth which outlined its provisions. This Mozarabic polemicist then observed that Christians will not, therefore, accept Muḥammad as a prophet because the Messiah said that "It is not fitting that a man should divorce his wife unless she commits sexual sin."⁵⁴ When the author of *Liber denudationis* recounts this same law, citing verse 2:230 just as al-Qūṭī had, he decries it as a *lex immundissima, nec minus irrationabilis* (7.11). Norman Daniel observed that this law became "an obsession with the Christian West,"⁵⁵ but in this the West and Mozarabs only adopted a polemical approach that had been formulated in the East several centuries earlier. The *Apology*, for example, makes much of this same law, insisting that it is more abominable and repulsive than the practice of the Zoroastrians.⁵⁶

The Annotator of Robert of Ketton's translation of the Qur'ān contains a number of arguments of Oriental-Christian origin. Like the *Apology of Kindt*, which pointedly quotes verse 17:59—"And nothing hindered Us from sending you with miraculous signs except that earlier people disbelieved them"—the Annotator asserts that Muḥammad himself "says almost everywhere that the power to work miracles was not given to him," and so made plain that he was not a prophet.⁵⁷ Like the *Apology* again, he asserts that Muḥammad was taught his heretical knowledge of the scriptures by a "certain apostate and heretical Nestorian monk named Sergius."⁵⁸ Just as the author of the *Apology* takes great delight in

⁵⁴ "Li-anna al-Masīḥ yaqūlu, 'lā yanbaghī li-rajul ṭalāq zawjatihi illā an taz-niya" (*Taḥlīṭ al-waḥdānīyah* in al-Qurṭubī, pp. 215-16).

⁵⁵ N. Daniel, *Islam and the West*, p. 137.

⁵⁶ *Risālat al-Kindt*, p. 172. The fragmentary *Kitāb al-ḥurāf* which is probably of Oriental origin as well (see chapter two above, p. 93) likewise denigrates this law; see the fragment quoted in al-Qurṭubī, p. 448.

⁵⁷ ". . . cum fere ubique dicat non sibi datum esse facere miracula . . ." (Annotator, 36rb, rm c. ll. 22-23); cf. *Risālat al-Kindt*, p. 97. This is also a central theme of *Liber denudationis*; see 4.2 & 12.8.

⁵⁸ "Qu[i]dam monach[us] apostat[a] et heretic[us] Nestorian[us] nomine Sergi[us] . . . qui . . . omnes fabulas et scripturas apochrifas tam Iudeorum quam hereticorum ei insinualet" (Annotator, 57rb, rm. c. ll. 7-9, 15-16; cf. *Risālat al-Kindt*, pp. 127-29). In this case, by the way, the influence is direct since the Annotator says that he has this information from "a certain good and learned Christian whose book is contained in this codex" (*Ibid.*, c. ll. 4-6); this is an obvious reference to the *Apology*, the Latin translation of which is indeed

pointing out Muḥammad's fondness for women, the Annotator calls on the Latin reader of the Qur'ān to "Notice his great attentiveness toward women."⁵⁹

*

Moreover, Oriental-Christian influence over the Mozarabs may be detected in arguments of a more substantial sort, as the remaining three examples illustrate. In chapter three of the *Liber denudationis*, the author defends the Christian scriptures against the Islamic insistence upon their "corruption" (*tahrīf*). Muslims claimed, with Qur'ānic and Traditional justification, that Christians and Jews had colluded in distorting their holy writings, effacing from them prophecies regarding the coming of Muḥammad, and adding (on the part of the Christians) heretical statements in support of, for example, the Trinity and Incarnation.⁶⁰ It was naturally in the interest of Christians to refute this claim, which had become the centerpiece of many Muslim polemical works against the people of the book,⁶¹ and the author of the *Liber denudationis* did so by observing that God must have preserved the scriptures among his faithful, both before the time of Muḥammad and after, else

How could the Christians and the Jews, who oppose each other in the extreme, . . . everywhere have falsified their holy scripture <in

preserved in the same codex in fols. 140-78; cf. M.-Th. d'Alverny, "Deux traductions," pp. 87, 108.

⁵⁹ "Nota magnam diligentiam eius circa mulieres" (Annotator, 31vb, lm c. ll. 16-20; cf. *Risālat al-Kindī*, p. 81).

⁶⁰ Some Muslims, e. g. Ibn Sīnā, believed that Christians and Jews only distorted or corrupted the *meaning* of the words in their scriptures without actually changing them. For a complete discussion of both this view and the more radical view just described, held, e. g., by Ibn Ḥazm, see J. Gandel and R. Caspar, "Textes de la tradition musulmane concernant le *tahrīf*," pp. 61-104 *passim*.

⁶¹ Ibn Ḥazm's attack on the Jewish and Christian scriptures mentioned in chapter one above is the most thorough example; see *al-Faṣl* 2:13-217, M. Asín-Palacios, *Abenḥázam de Córdoba* 3:21-128; cf. E. Fritsch, *Islam und Christentum im Mittelalter*, pp. 39ff, who argues that it was the notion of *tahrīf* that was the unifying principle of all Islamic polemic against Christians and Jews.

the same way > . . . while dispersed throughout the world . . . ? For either this happened secretly, and some codex [of the Bible] would have remained intact, or it was publicly well-known, and these things would not have been concealed from the histories of the nations.⁶²

This argument, which is doubtless the first substantial refutation of *tahrīf* in Western Europe,⁶³ bears striking similarity to arguments found in Oriental sources such as Timothy's dialogue with al-Mahdī and the *Apology*. In the longer version of his dialogue, the Catholicos Timothy observes that "there is not found in the world a hostility like that which has existed, both before and in the present, between Christians and Jews;" how could they possibly have colluded in falsifying their scriptures?⁶⁴ Similarly, the author of the *Apology* asks how nations different in religion and sects scattered throughout every land could agree to falsify their scriptures; rather, "We and the Jews, who are opposed to us, are in agreement in confirming the veracity [of scripture] without collusion."⁶⁵

But it is not just this argument that *Liber denudationis* has in common with earlier Oriental rebuttals of the charge of *tahrīf*. To further solidify his argument that the Christian scriptures are authentic, the author of *Liber denudationis* pointed out that the Qur'ān itself proclaims that this is so when it says in 10:94, "If he were in doubt about this which we made come down to you [i. e. the Qur'ān], let him inquire of those who read the book before you."⁶⁶ The *Apology* likewise quotes this verse from Sūrat Yūnus in order to show that Christians have not changed or distorted the Bible.⁶⁷

The fourth example is provided by a short demonstration of the divinity of Jesus found in the *Letter of al-Qūṭī*, and by a much

⁶² *Liber denudationis* 3.4.

⁶³ al-Qūṭī's brief comments hardly qualify as an argument against it, see al-Khazraǵī 8, p. 37.

⁶⁴ "Laysa tūjadu 'adāwah fī al-ʿālam mithlamā kānat qablan wa-al-ān bayna al-Naṣārā wa-al-Yahūd" (Ṭīmāthāwus, *al-Muḥāwarah al-dīnīyah* 2, p. 416).

⁶⁵ "Naḥnu wa-al-Yahūd al-mukhālīfūna la-nā muttafiqūna ʿalā taṣdīqihī ʿan ghayr tawāṭu'" (*Risālat al-Kindī* p. 116; cf. pp. 106 and 224-25).

⁶⁶ *Liber denudationis* 3.2.

⁶⁷ *Risālat al-Kindī*, p. 225.

longer demonstration of the same kind in the *Liber denudationis*. Both arguments take as their starting point the Qur'ānic description of Jesus as God's word and spirit. "Have you not heard," the priest al-Qūṭī asks rhetorically,

what is in the book which the author of your religious law brought: that [Jesus] "is the spirit of God and His word (4:171)," and that He was "excellent in this world and the next and among those brought near [to God] (3:45)"? And where is there anyone more excellent in this world and the next than the Messiah, the Son of God? ⁶⁸

Though al-Qūṭī has expressed himself rather compactly, he clearly argues here that the Qur'ān itself implies that Jesus is the divine Son of God by identifying Him with God's word and spirit and describing Him as the most excellent of men.

This same idea is worked out at much greater length in the most difficult passage of *Liber denudationis*, the central portion of chapter ten (10.8-13). Having compared the lives of Muḥammad and Jesus as they appear in the Qur'ān in the first part of the chapter (10.2-7), the author abruptly changes course here, attempting to demonstrate that Jesus was the Son of God. As I noted in chapter one, the author relies heavily in this passage on another Christian writer; this writer was almost certainly an Oriental Christian writing in Arabic.

Though this section of the text is more difficult to follow than usual because the author of *Liber denudationis* has mixed together his own thoughts with those of this Oriental-Christian author in a haphazard fashion, it is nevertheless quite clear what the thrust of his argument is. He first cites two verses of the Qur'ān, 4:171 and 3:59, in which, respectively, Jesus is identified as the "word of God which He infuses into Mary, and a spirit from Him (10.8)," ⁶⁹

⁶⁸ "A-lam tasma' mā fī al-kitāb alladhī jā'a bi-hi ṣāhib sharī'atika annahu rūḥ Allāh wa-kalimatuḥu wa-annahu kāna 'wajīhan fī al-dunyā wa-al-ākhirah wa-min al-muqarrabīna wa-ayna awjah fī al-dunyā wa-al-ākhirah min al-Masīḥ ibn Allāh?" (al-Qūṭī in al-Khazrajī 3, p. 31).

⁶⁹ The Latin here translates the Arabic faithfully, though it is peculiar that we lack in the Latin version the first part of the verse which explicitly names Jesus (*al-Masīḥ 'Isā ibn Maryam*) as the subject of the above predicate nominative, making it difficult at first reading to identify who is being described as the "word of God". The colophon of the translation indicates that the translators abbreviated the work as they went along: this passage could well be the unhappy result.

but then is said to be “just like Adam whom [God] created from clay, and He said to him ‘Be!’ and He was (10.8).”⁷⁰ If Muḥammad had confined himself to the first statement, the author of *Liber denudationis* observes, then the Trinity would have been confirmed and believed by men; but by citing the second he evacuates the first of any meaning. In order to determine the truth, therefore, the author examines each verse separately. In the first verse when Muḥammad says “spirit,” he seems to intend that it be taken in a personal sense (*uelle uidetur quod dicitur “spiritus” accipi personaliter*, 10.8) for the spirit who is from God, that is the Holy Spirit who caused Mary to conceive Jesus when God poured his Word upon her. Furthermore, if it is necessary to take “spirit” in this verse with its essential meaning of “the Holy Spirit,” it is also necessary to take “word” in the same way: For “just as the word which goes out from the mouth of a corruptible man necessarily is corruptible, so also the Word which went forth from eternity . . . must necessarily be eternal,” for this word is “the wisdom proceeding from [God] (10.10).” The “word” mentioned in the verse is, therefore, the eternal Word of God (10.10).

But Muḥammad then said in the second verse that Jesus was created from clay like Adam, and in saying this he equates God’s Word and Spirit with clay. This, in the mind of the author, is tantamount to saying that this Word and this Spirit do not exist, and this is impossible, “For a god who has neither a word nor a spirit is a statue which neither sees nor breathes (10.11).”⁷¹ Rather, Christians believe in a God who sees and hears⁷² and has

⁷⁰ The Latin here also faithfully translates the Qur’ān’s Arabic.

⁷¹ Though the general argument described here resembles a ninth-century Palestinian Christian work to be described below, this particular assertion that those who deny a word and spirit in God believe in a God who is a dead statue is very reminiscent of Trinitarian arguments made by a ninth-century Iraqi Christian, ‘Ammār al-Baṣrī in his *Kūāb al-burhān* 5, pp. 46-48; cf. S. Griffith, “‘Ammār al-Baṣrī’s *Kūāb al-burhān*, pp. 168-70. For bibliography on ‘Ammār see n. 101 below.

⁷² The author here is prominently using certain attributes which orthodox Muslims also ascribe to God. The Qur’ān says that God is He Who Sees (*al-baṣīr*) and He Who Hears (*al-sāmīʿ*), and consequently sight (*baṣar*) and hearing (*samʿ*) came to be considered two of the handful of eternal attributes of God; see D. Gimaret, *La doctrine d’al-Ashʿarī*, pp. 265-66.

both a Word and Spirit. This Word, “embodied from the Virgin, remained visibly among men and walked on the earth (10.12)” so that all could see Him; and this incarnate Word was also one with the Spirit which worked miracles through which that Spirit was visible to the eyes of reason (10.12). Jesus was therefore the perfect and one God incarnate with two natures and two wills, the *verus filius Dei* proceeding coeternally from God (10.13).

Now as Rachid Haddad has observed, Oriental Arab-Christian apologists were very fond of exploiting the Trinitarian potentialities of verse 4:171 and others like it (e. g. 3:45) which suggest that God has a Word and Spirit. Since there was a great deal of scriptural and patristic precedent for identifying the members of the Trinity as “God”, “the Word”, and “the Spirit”, it was only natural that such language in the Qur’ān would be used to help defend the doctrine of the Trinity.⁷³ But Oriental Arab Christians also realized—long before al-Qūṭī and the author of *Liber denudationis* formulated their Christological arguments—that these same verses could be used to demonstrate Christ’s divinity. In fact, an anonymous ninth-century south-Palestinian work known as *On the Triune Nature of the One God*⁷⁴ contains a Christological-Trinitarian argument that is strikingly similar to the Christological arguments developed by the two Mozarabic apologists three centuries later. Like the *Liber denudationis*, this work consistently refers to the persons of the Trinity as “God” (*Allāh*), “the Word” (*kalimah*), and “the Spirit” (*rūḥ*):⁷⁵ “We do not say three Gods . . . but rather we believe that God and His Word and His Spirit are one God.”⁷⁶ Like both the Mozarabic apologists, the author of *On the Triune Nature* emphasizes that

⁷³ R. Haddad, *La Trinité divine* pp. 125, 211-12; a good example of this approach can be found in Ṭīmāthāwus, *al-Muḥāwarah al-dīnīyah* I, 7-10, pp. 128-31.

⁷⁴ *Fī tathlīth Allāh al-wāḥid*, ed. by M. D. Gibson in *Studia Sinaitica* 7 (London, 1899):74-107; cf. *Bibliographie* 12. 4, *Islamochristiana* 1 (1975):153. Note that the editor has supplied the Arabic title; the work has no title in the ms.

⁷⁵ Rather than, for example, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, or Creator, Redeemer, and Sanctifier.

⁷⁶ “Wa-lasnā naqūlu thalāthat ālihah . . . wa-lakinnā naqūlu anna Allāh wa-kalimatahu wa-rūḥahu ilāh wāḥid” (*Fī tathlīth Allāh al-wāḥid*, pp. 75-76).

Muḥammad himself taught this in such verses as 4:171 and 16:102, and even ordered his followers to “believe in God and His Word and also in His Holy Spirit.”⁷⁷ The Palestinian author can claim, therefore, that “we find in the Torah and the Prophets and Psalms and Gospel, and you find in the Qur’ān, that God and His Word and His Spirit are one God.”⁷⁸ Furthermore, in the same way that the *Liber denudationis* argued that the Word and Spirit were eternally part of God, *On the Triune Nature* argues that God never existed independently of his Word and Spirit: “God never existed . . . without a Word and a Spirit . . . His Word and His Spirit were in God and with God before He made created things.”⁷⁹

Liber denudationis argued, furthermore, that had not the Word become incarnate in unity with the Holy Spirit, men could not have perceived Him. The author of *On the Triune Nature* similarly wrote that “We know not that God was made manifest on the earth or involved Himself with mankind except when He informed us of it through the Messiah, His Word and His Spirit.”⁸⁰ Like Arab-Christian theologians in general,⁸¹ moreover, *On the Triune Nature* explained the relationship of God to the Word by means of analogies:

We say that the Father gives birth to the Word just as the sun gives birth to the rays [of light] and just as the mind gives birth to the word and just as fire gives birth to heat; and none of these things is in any way prior to that which is born from it.⁸²

⁷⁷ “Wa-qāla [Muḥammad], āminū bi-Allāh wa-kalimatihi wa-ayḍan fī rūḥ al-quḍs” (*Fī tathlūth Allāh al-wāḥid*, p. 77).

⁷⁸ “Najidu fī al-Tawrah wa-al-Anbiyā’ wa-al-Zabūr wa-al-Injīl wa-antum tajidūnahu fī al-Qur’ān anna Allāh wa-kalimatuhu wa-ruḥuhu ilāh wāḥid” (*Fī tathlūth Allāh al-wāḥid*, p. 77-78).

⁷⁹ “Wa-lam yakun Allāh . . . dūna kalimah wa-rūḥ . . . kānat kalimatuhu wa-rūḥuhu ‘inda Allāh wa-bi-Allāh qabla an yakluqa al-khalā’iq” (*Fī tathlūth Allāh al-wāḥid*, p. 77).

⁸⁰ “Lā na‘lamu anna Allāh uriya ‘alā al-arḍ aw khālaṭa al-nās illā hīna aṭla‘anā bi-al-Masīḥ kalimatihi wa-rūḥihi” (*Fī tathlūth Allāh al-wāḥid*, pp. 99-100; cf. R. Haddad, *La Trinité divine* p. 214).

⁸¹ See here R. Haddad, *La Trinité divine*, p. 115; cf. Marcuzzo’s commentary to *Majālis Ibrāhīm* 218, G. Marcuzzo, *Le dialogue d’Abraham de Tibériade*, p. 368, n. 53.

⁸² “Naqūlu anna al-Ab walada kalimatahu kamā talidu al-shams al-shu‘ā‘ wa-kamā yalidu al-‘aql al-kalimah wa-kamā talidu al-nār al-sukhūnah . . . lam yakun

Liber denudationis says the same thing in a strikingly similar passage:

[Jesus was] the true Son of God . . . coeternally proceeding from God, just as the birth of heat from a fire, light from the sun, intellect from the soul, <and> the precious stone's lustre <radiating> from it, in all of which one thing does not precede the other.⁸³

This textual parallel and the other similarities already cited,⁸⁴ suggest that *On the Triune Nature of the One God* may well be the source for this passage of *Liber denudationis*. But even if this is not the case—which is possible given the popularity of this sort of argument among Oriental Arab Christians—the obvious similarity of basic Christological approach found in the ninth-century Palestinian work and the two twelfth-century Mozarabic works makes clear that these two Mozarabs were arguing very much in a tradition developed at an earlier date by their Oriental coreligionists. Such arguments, based on detailed knowledge of the Qur'ān, were certainly not available in Spain in Latin sources during this period.

Immediately after arguing for the divinity of Jesus in the manner just described, the author of the *Liber denudationis* then answered two Muslim objections to Jesus' divinity. His response to the first of these, together with similar arguments propounded by two other Mozarabic apologists, provides a final example of how Mozarabs adopted argumentative strategies devised by earlier Oriental Arab Christians. How is it possible—this *obiectio prima* reads—that “the one whom heaven and earth are not able to contain, the one who, rather, contains all things Himself, was able to be circumscribed in the womb of a virgin?”⁸⁵ *Liber denudationis*'

shay' min hā'ulā'i qabla alladhī wulida min-hu" (*Fi tathlith Allāh al-wāḥid*, p. 77).

⁸³ *Liber denudationis* 10.13.

⁸⁴ And there are still further textual similarities between *On the Triune Nature* and chapter ten of *Liber denudationis* which I have not mentioned: their mutual insistence on St. Mary's virginity even after she gave birth to Jesus, their use of the Qur'ānic verse 50:38, and their observation that Jesus gave his disciples power over demons and every sickness; see *Liber denudationis* 10.6, 10.10, 10.7, and *Fi tathlith Allāh al-wāḥid*, pp. 83, 79, 84.

⁸⁵ *Liber denudationis* 10.14. This is a common Muslim objection. Al-Qurṭubī, for example, raises it in his rebuttal of the *Tathlith al-waḥdānīyah*; see p. 151.

author answers this question by setting forth (in 10.15-17) a series of more common examples (*grossiora exempla*) which demonstrate how this could have occurred: God walked in the Garden of Eden, saying, "Adam, where are you (cf. Gn 3:9)?" and Adam heard the sound of His feet. God also entered the house of Abraham, even though that house was too small to contain Him, and still He did not cease being immense. "So also when He spoke to Moses in the . . . bush . . . neither the bush grew, nor was the boundlessness of God diminished (10.15)." Moreover, "you infidel," the Christian author says rhetorically to his Muslim readers, "do you not read in the Qur'ān" that God is sitting on a throne (cf. Qur'ān 40:15), this also implying that He can be contained spacially yet not cease to be the lord of all things (10.16). Furthermore, according to a ḥadīth (*de narratione*),⁸⁶ Muslims believe that on judgement day when God orders the damned to be thrown into the fire, the fire itself will say, "are there not more (*nunquid plures sunt*)?" And however many more are cast in, the fire will continue to ask for more until God places His foot in it. Then He will insert his finger into the fire and draw out those whom He chooses (10.17).⁸⁷ "Do not wonder, therefore, if, while remaining boundless, in the womb of the Virgin <God> was circumscribed by flesh alone (10.15)."

The anonymous author of *Tathlīth al-waḥdānīyah* adopts this same approach to demonstrating the possibility of incarnation. After explaining why only the second member of the Trinity became incarnate,⁸⁸ and then commenting on other aspects of the Christian doctrine of the Incarnation,⁸⁹ this Mozarabic author then argues at some length that the fact accepted by Jews, Christians, and Muslims alike that God spoke to Moses in the burning bush

⁸⁶ In the following chapter the Mozarabs' polemical use of the Ḥadīth will be described at length; as I argue there, the Latin word *narratio*, and several other words besides, normally mean "ḥadīth" in this text.

⁸⁷ The author of *Liber denudationis* is here recounting a ḥadīth found in several versions in al-Bukhārī; see 65, sūrah 50, *bab* 1. 1-5; 97. 7. 2, and esp. 97. 25. 2.

⁸⁸ *Tathlīth al-waḥdānīyah* in al-Qurṭubī, p. 91.

⁸⁹ *Tathlīth al-waḥdānīyah* in al-Qurṭubī, p. 97.

demonstrates that the Incarnation is possible. He begins by pointing out to his Muslim readers that “your book says that Moses heard God and He spoke to him directly.”⁹⁰ How can this be if, as Muslims believe, God cannot be apprehended by any sensation, since He is not created or like any created thing? If you answer, he says addressing his Muslim reader, that God spoke to Moses personally (*bi-dhātihī*), then God would need some sort of speech organ, and to assert this would be anthropomorphism. If you say that God created the speech through which He spoke to Moses, then you have established that this speech, a *created* thing, said to Moses

“I am God; there is no god except Me, so worship Me (20:14),” and you have established that the speech was a mediator between God and Moses, and that Moses affirmed lordship in it by his saying, “Lord show yourself to me that I may behold you (7:143)!”⁹¹

If you say that the sound did not say “I am God,” but rather that these words were only present in Moses’ ears (*masāmiʿ*), Christians answer that it was the sound of the speech which inspired him to act: had Moses not seen the fire and made his way to the bush and heard the words of God in it, he would not have known what God wanted him to do. If, the Christian author rhetorically asks, Moses just heard these words internally without the mediation of fire, bush, and words, what is the point of mentioning these things in the Qurʾān? But since God did speak through the burning bush, and it “occupied for [Moses] the place of a creator, he called it a god.”⁹²

The remainder of the argument, quoted some pages later in al-Qurṭubī’s refutation, then applies this same line of reasoning to Jesus. Since there is no doubt about the veracity of the burning bush when it said “I am God,” so also, *Tathlīth al-waḥdānīyah*’s

⁹⁰ “Inna kitābakum yaqūlu inna Mūsā samīʿa Allāh wa-kallamahu taklīmān” *Tathlīth al-waḥdānīyah* in al-Qurṭubī, p. 105 (cf. sūrah 4.164).

⁹¹ “‘Anā Allāh lā ilāh illā anā fa-uʿbudnī’ wa-athbattum anna al-kalām wāsiṭah bayna Allāh wa-bayna Mūsā wa-anna Mūsā aqarra bi-al-rubūbiyah la-hā li-qawlihi ‘rabbi arinī unẓur ilayka’” (*Tathlīth al-waḥdānīyah* in al-Qurṭubī, p. 105).

⁹² “qāma ʿindahu maqām khāliq fa-sammāhu ilāh” (*Tathlīth al-waḥdānīyah* in al-Qurṭubī, p. 106).

author argues, there can be no doubt about the veracity of Jesus the Messiah when he said "I am God." Indeed, "the body of the Messiah and his speech when He spoke with sovereignty are just like the body of the fire and [its] speech when it addressed Moses with sovereignty."⁹³ It cannot, moreover, be claimed that Moses did not worship the fire the way Christians worship Jesus, since the fire said "Worship me" and Moses bowed down before it just as Christians worship Jesus. The anonymous author then responds to certain possible objections. If, for example, Muslims should deny that Jesus said what Christians believe He said, then they are really attacking the Bible upon which Christian faith is based, even though the Bible and the Qur'ān are in agreement about the incident of Moses and the burning bush. In conclusion, the author of *Tathlith al-wahdānīyah* points out that both Christians and Muslims believe that Jesus will come again on the day of judgement as mediator and judge, and this also demonstrates the possibility that a man can be a mediator between God and humanity.⁹⁴

The fragments of Aghushtīn's *Maṣḥaf al-ʿālam al-kā'in* quoted by al-Qurṭubī also contain an example of this same sort of argument. "The three religious communities," Aghushtīn writes, referring here to the Jews, Christians, and Muslims, "have agreed that God (He is exalted!) addressed Moses directly and they agree that Moses heard a voice saying to him 'I am your Lord.'"⁹⁵ Just as the author of *Tathlith al-wahdānīyah* had done, Aghushtīn then goes on to show that

Just as it was possible that [God] should adopt a voice [when He spoke to Moses] and make it a mediator for His will so that He make it manifest in [the voice], so also He is able to adopt any form

⁹³ "jism al-Masīḥ wa-kalāmuhu lammā khaṭaba bi-al-rubūbīyah mithl jism al-nār wa-al-kalām idhā khaṭaba Mūsā bi-al-rubūbīyah" (*Tathlith al-wahdānīyah* in al-Qurṭubī, p. 115).

⁹⁴ *Tathlith al-wahdānīyah* in al-Qurṭubī, pp. 115-17.

⁹⁵ "qad ajmaʿat [al-thalāth milal] ʿalā anna Allāh taʿālā qad kallama Mūsā taklīman wa-ijṭamaʿat ʿalā anna Mūsā samiʿa ṣawtan yaqūlu la-hu 'Anā rabbuka'" (Aghushtīn in al-Qurṭubī, p. 143). Both eds. have *al-millah* in place of the portion in brackets, but later when al-Qurṭubī requotes this line (p. 147) in order to refute it, he has *al-thalāth milal* which is almost surely what Aghushtīn originally wrote. Cf. Qu'rān 4:164.

He wants and to manifest Himself to His servants in whatever embellishment suits Him.⁹⁶

Humans who hear the voice of God or see Him in some form, furthermore, are obliged to admit that they have heard God Himself or seen Him, just as Moses, Adam, and Daniel all did in various ways. God has, therefore, honored various created things by making them mediators between Himself and creation. We are obliged to honor them accordingly by acknowledging their lordship, and giving them the name of God.⁹⁷

Having shown all this, Aghushtīn asserts that nothing remains except to discuss “the mediator which He adopted on our behalf, and that is the Messiah, the testimony regarding whom is in the Torah and the Gospel.”⁹⁸ After observing that, if God can communicate to men in language like theirs, there is no reason why He cannot appear to them in a form like theirs, Aghushtīn then lists a variety of “testimonies” from the Torah and Gospel relating to the appearance of God in the form of Jesus. Isaiah, for example, prophesied that

A virgin will conceive and bear a son and call her son Wonderful Governor, Mighty God, Father of the coming age of the world. His kingdom shall increase, and there will be no end to his rule (Is 7:14).

After a few more scriptural citations, the fragment containing this argument abruptly ends.⁹⁹ But Aghushtīn’s point is quite clear: like the authors of *Liber denudationis* and *Tathlūth al-wahdānīyah*, he contends that if God can be present in and speak to Moses through a created medium, then He surely can be present in and speak to man through any created medium He chooses, including

⁹⁶ “Ka-mā jāza an yattakhidha ṣawtan wa-yaj‘aluhu ḥijāban li-irādātihi ḥattā aẓharahā fī-hi ka-dhālika yajūzu an yakūna qādiran ‘alā itikhādh ayy ṣūrah shā’a wa-an yazhura li-‘ibādīhi fī ayy hilyah wāfaqat-hu” (Aghushūn in al-Qurṭubī, p. 144). This use of *ḥijāb* (“veil,” “curtain”) to mean “mediator,” especially with respect to Jesus, can be found elsewhere in Arab-Christian literature; see *Majālis Ibrāhīm* 303, G. Marcuzzo, *Le dialogue d’Abraham de Tibériade*, p. 402-03, n. 106.

⁹⁷ Aghushūn in al-Qurṭubī, pp. 144-45.

⁹⁸ “Iam yabqa ‘alaynā min al-kalām shay’ illā fī al-ḥijāb alladhī ittakhadhahu minnā wa-huwa al-Masīḥ wa-al-istishhād bi-al-Tawrah wa-al-Injīl fī amrihi” (*Tathlūth al-wahdānīyah* in al-Qurṭubī, p. 145).

⁹⁹ Aghushūn in al-Qurṭubī, pp. 145-47.

the form of a man. Furthermore, scripture tells us prophetically that God intended to take on the form of a man long before this actually happened in the birth of Jesus.

Like the Mozarabic arguments in rebuttal of the accusation that they had corrupted their scriptures, and like the attempt of al-Qūfī and the author of *Liber denudationis* to demonstrate the divinity of Jesus on the basis of the Qur'ān, the kernel of these arguments for the possibility of Incarnation also can be traced to an Oriental Arab-Christian work written considerably earlier. In a compendium of Christian theology known as *Kitāb al-burhān* (*The Book of Proof*),¹⁰⁰ the Nestorian 'Ammār al-Baṣrī (d. c. 825),¹⁰¹ one of the most important early Oriental Arab-Christian writers, also attempted to demonstrate the possibility of the Incarnation by arguing that it is the culmination of a long series of instances in which God made Himself known to man through created mediators. 'Ammār develops this argument in the course of a rather wide-ranging discussion of the Incarnation in which, among other things, he presents four reasons why God appeared in human form, these reasons obviously being addressed to Muslims.¹⁰² While discussing the first of these—that mankind by its nature cannot arrive at knowledge of God without God communicating such knowledge through some created medium¹⁰³—'Ammār observes that both the Old Testament and the Qur'ān make clear that God manifests himself in various ways to mankind. God spoke to Adam, Noah, Abraham and other prophets according to the Old Testament, and, he pointedly observes, "He spoke to Moses from the tree (*min al-shajarah*), just as those who disagree [with us] affirm."¹⁰⁴ Like the Andalusī writers, 'Ammār is making

¹⁰⁰ 'Ammār al-Baṣrī, *Kitāb al-burhān*, pp. 19-90 (Arabic).

¹⁰¹ On 'Ammār see G. Graf, *Geschichte der christlichen arabischen Literatur* 2:210-211 and M. Hayek, 'Ammār al-Baṣrī, pp. 13-46 (French), 7-18 (Arabic); for later bibliography see S. Griffith, "'Ammār al-Baṣrī's *Kitāb al-burhān*," pp. 145-81.

¹⁰² S. Griffith, "'Ammār al-Baṣrī's *Kitāb al-burhān*," p. 174; on this passage in general see *ibid.*, pp. 174-77, and M. Hayek, 'Ammār al-Baṣrī, pp. 53-54 (French).

¹⁰³ 'Ammār al-Baṣrī, *Kitāb al-burhān* 7, pp. 64-67 (Arabic).

¹⁰⁴ "Wa-kallama Mūsá min al-shajarah kamā yuqirru al-mukhālifūn" ('Ammār al-Baṣrī, *Kitāb al-burhān* 7, p. 66 [Arabic]).

explicit reference here to the Qur'ānic version of Moses at the burning bush, not only by mentioning that "those who disagree with us" (a euphemism for Muslims in this work) confirm that this occurred, but by using explicitly Qur'ānic wording: Sūrat al-Qaṣaṣ (28:30) likewise says that God spoke to Moses *min al-shajarah*, "from the tree." In all these instances, 'Ammār argues, as well as others mentioned in both the Old Testament and the Qur'ān, God made himself known to men through some created mediator which their senses could apprehend. Therefore,

it is incumbent upon all people of intelligence who affirm the [holy] books that they know that the manifestation of God to mankind in a human being from among them is even more representative of His graciousness and goodness and generosity, and more effective in verifying His immutability and existence for them¹⁰⁵

than His self-manifestation to them in an ark made of wood or a lowly bush or any other created medium.¹⁰⁶

Here, therefore, in a work written before 825, is essentially the same argument as that propounded in the twelfth century by the three Mozarabic apologists: the various well-known Biblical and Qur'ānic theophanies, and especially the incident of Moses at the burning bush recounted in such detail in both scriptures, all demonstrate that God can and does appear to men through the medium of created things, but does not cease to be the ruler of the universe by doing so.¹⁰⁷

¹⁰⁵ "Wa-lazima jamī' ahl al-ʿuqūl al-muqirrīna bi-al-kutub an yaʿlama anna zuhūr Allāh li-al-nās fī bashar min-hum ashbahu bi-faḍlihi wa-jūdihi wa-karamihi wa-ashaddu li-taṣḥīṭi thabāṭihi wa-wujūdihi 'indahum" ('Ammār al-Baṣrī, *Kūāb al-burhān* 7, p. 67 [Arabic]).

¹⁰⁶ It is worth noting that 'Ammār, like the author of *Tahtlūh al-wahdāntyah*, argues that the Muslim view that mankind will be judged on the day of resurrection by a judge which they can see also demonstrates the possibility of Incarnation; see 'Ammār al-Baṣrī, *Kūāb al-burhān* 7, pp. 68-69 (Arabic).

¹⁰⁷ Moreover, Ibn Ḥazm provides evidence that this argument was known in Spain in the eleventh century as well, for he quotes a very brief version of it in the course of his discussion of the various Christian views of the Incarnation: "But if they say, 'what do you say about what is in your book [i. e. the Qur'ān], since it never happened to a man (*mā kāna li-bashar*) that God spoke to him except through revelation (*waḥyan*) or from behind a veil (*min warā'i hijāb*); for He addressed Moses from the side of a mountain, from a tree, and from bank of a river;' then we say . . ." (Ibn Ḥazm, *al-Faṣl* 1:129). The arguments of the two Mozarabic apologists and 'Ammār al-Baṣrī are examples of what Griffith calls "Christian *Kalām*" (see his "'Ammār al-Baṣrī's *Kūāb al-burhān*," *passim*, esp.

*

That the Mozarabs used religious vocabulary and apologetic approaches developed by Oriental Christians centuries earlier is vivid evidence that these eleventh- and twelfth-century Spaniards had read and been influenced by Oriental-Christian works such as the *Apology*, Timothy's dialogue with al-Mahdī, and the *Dialogue of Abraham*. But how extensive was this influence? Were these Mozarabic works wholly derivative of Oriental models? In part, these questions are currently unanswerable, since so much of the Arab-Christian theological and apologetic tradition remains unedited and unstudied. We cannot, therefore, make blanket statements about the relation of the Andalusī tradition to the Oriental.

Nevertheless, a few things are clear. It is certain, as Professor van Koningsveld has shown, that Alphonsi's dialogue against the Saracens is almost completely dependent on the *Apology* for its information about the life of the Prophet and Islam;¹⁰⁸ it is just as certain, however, that none of the other Andalusī works studied here are wholly derivative of the few Oriental Arab-Christian works known to have been in Spain.

This is particularly clear with respect to the *Liber denudationis*. The main themes of this work—Muḥammad's unprophetic behavior; his warlike nature; the Qur'ān's contradictions and unseemly contents; the licentious nature of the Prophet and his religion; the validity of the Christian scriptures and the Christian doctrines of Trinity and Incarnation—are the same as those of the *Apology*.¹⁰⁹ Moreover, at some points their approaches are virtually identical:

pp. 146-48). The significance of the practice of Christian *Kalām* in Spain will be discussed in chapter five below in connection with certain clearer examples.

¹⁰⁸ See his "Petrus Alfonsi, een 12de eeuwse schakel tussen islam en christendom in Spanje," *passim*; and also his "La apología de al-Kindī," p. 114-15, notes 15 and 18, where he notes that Petrus borrows even "detalles textuales y el orden de la presentación de los mismos" from the *Apology*.

¹⁰⁹ These themes are the basic themes of Arab-Christian polemic as described earlier in this chapter.

both works similarly respond to the Muslim accusation that Christians have corrupted their scriptures, using the same argument and even quoting the same Qur'ānic verse as evidence.¹¹⁰ Yet it is surprising how frequently and substantially the two works diverge in detail. For example, they both recount at great length (and with equal distortion) the history of the compilation of the Qur'ān, with the same polemical purpose and the same underlying assertion: that the Qur'ān itself had been corrupted, changed, added to, and rewritten in the generations after Muḥammad.¹¹¹ Yet while both the author of the *Apology* and the author of *Liber denudationis* claim that al-Ḥajjāj ibn Yūsuf changed the Qur'ān in various ways in the later seventh century,¹¹² their accounts of exactly which sūrahs and what verses were changed are almost completely different, each writer relying on or inventing new traditions regarding this aspect of the compilation of the Qur'ān.¹¹³

Likewise, both the Mozarab and the Oriental-Christian attribute the Prophet's skewed knowledge of the Bible to his heretical teachers; but the author of *Liber denudationis* says that these were the monk Baḥīrā and the converted Zoroastrian Salmān al-Fārisī and the Jew 'Abd Allāh ibn Salām, while the author of the *Apology* has it that these were, respectively, Sergius, a legendary heretical Christian monk based on the monk Baḥīrā of Islamic tradition,¹¹⁴ and the Jews 'Abd Allāh ibn Salām and Ka'b.¹¹⁵ This same combination of similarity in approach and marked difference in detail can be seen in the two authors refutation of the miracles attributed to Muḥammad. While both the author of *Liber denudationis* and the author of the *Apology* take pains to deny that the Prophet worked any miracles, and both quote the same Qur'ānic verse (17:59) which appears to confirm this,¹¹⁶ the specific miracles which they seek to disprove are completely dif-

¹¹⁰ See above, pp. 108-09.

¹¹¹ See *Liber denudationis* 5 & 6 passim, and *Risālat al-Kindī*, pp. 128-47.

¹¹² See *Liber denudationis* 6.3, and *Risālat al-Kindī*, pp. 131, 137.

¹¹³ See *Liber denudationis* 6.3, and *Risālat al-Kindī*, pp. 131, 135-37.

¹¹⁴ See N. Daniel, *Islam and the West*, pp. 4-5, 88-89, 235-37.

¹¹⁵ See *Liber denudationis* 5.1-2, and *Risālat al-Kindī*, pp. 128-29.

¹¹⁶ *Liber denudationis* 4.2; *Risālat al-Kindī*, p. 97.

ferent: *Liber denudationis* attempts to debunk Muḥammad's miraculous night journey (4.6, 12.1-8), and the miracle of the splitting of the moon (9.11-16), while the *Apology* refutes neither of these, attacking instead a variety of miracles involving animals, poisoned food, and water pitchers.¹¹⁷

The author of the *Liber denudationis* doubtless had read the *Apology*, since it was known in Spain and was widely read throughout the Islamic world; and he adopted the approach to Islam which informed that and other Oriental works. But he certainly was not dependent on the *Apology* for the many detailed examples he used in his refutation of Islam. These he learned directly from the Qur'ān and other Islamic literature¹¹⁸ or, possibly, from other Oriental works like the *Apology*. And what is true of the *Liber denudationis* is also true of *The Letter of al-Qūṭī*, *Tathlith al-wahdānīyah*, the fragments of Aghushtīn, the annotations of Robert of Ketton's translation of the Qur'ān, and even the stray comments attributed to Mozarabs by Ibn Ḥazm. None of these is wholly derivative of the Oriental Arab-Christian works which we know to have circulated in Spain in the Middle Ages.

In the current state of scholarship, therefore, it looks very much as if the eleventh- and twelfth-century Mozarabs, while writing largely within the Oriental apologetic tradition represented by the *Apology*, Timothy's dialogue, and the *Dialogue of Abraham*, were not—Petrus Alphonsi excepted—slavishly reliant on any one work or group of works representative of that tradition. Rather, the Mozarabs, while writing within the older Oriental Arab-Christian tradition, seem independently able to rework, revise, and recast what they have learned from the Melkite, Nestorian, and Jacobite writers whom they have read.

¹¹⁷ *Risālat al-Kindī*, pp. 103-08.

¹¹⁸ It is worth noting, in fact, that both works boast that they have exploited the texts of Islam directly, as the *Apology* asserted: "Innaka ta'lamu wa-kull man yanzuru fi kitābinā hādihā annanā lam naktub ilayka bi-shay' ziyādatan 'alā mā fi kitābika . . . wa-lam nuthbit illā al-ṣaḥīḥ mimmā naqalathu ruwātukum al-'ūdūl" (*Risālat al-Kindī*, p. 139); in the same vein the *Liber denudationis* claimed that if anyone found lies in its pages, he would only have shown that the Muḥammad's Qur'ān and his followers' Ḥadīth are filled with lies, "quia nos non respondemus eis nisi de suo volumine et de suorum narratoribus sotiorum" (*Liber denudationis* 1.2).

This conclusion would have to remain irretrievably provisional were it not that these same Mozarabic works contain important evidence of a very different kind attesting precisely to the independence and creativity with which the Mozarabs reworked this older tradition. It is true that we cannot currently compare these Andalusī texts with the whole corpus of Arab-Christian apologetic literature to determine exactly how the two traditions are related. Nevertheless, we can tell from how the Mozarabic authors drew frequently and directly on the collections of Ḥadīth and Qur'ānic commentaries as they composed their apologetic tracts, and we can infer from how insightfully some of these same Mozarabs drew on contemporary Latin-Christian theology for the same works, that these Arabic-speaking Christians of Spain in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, having thoroughly embraced the Oriental Arab-Christian apologetic tradition, still managed to move beyond it in surprising and substantial ways. But this is the burden of the next two chapters.

CHAPTER FOUR
“THAT WHICH HIS FOLLOWERS RELATED
FROM HIM”: THE MOZARABS’ POLEMICAL
USE OF ISLAMIC TRADITION

In the second paragraph of his treatise against Islam, the author of *Liber denudationis* asserted that if Muslims object to any lie in his work,

they <merely> demonstrate that their Qur’ān is mendacious, as well as their prophet and that which his companions and followers down to the present have handed down from him, for we will not respond to them except on the basis of his volume and the narrators of his companions.¹

And indeed, this Mozarabic author cites the Qur’ān explicitly some seventy-five times and quotes from Islamic Tradition—i. e., “that which his companions and followers . . . related from him”—at least thirty times.² While, therefore, this work conforms in its essentials so thoroughly to the Oriental Arab-Christian approach to Islam as described in the last chapter, nevertheless the most striking thing about it on first reading is the frequency with which its author quotes or paraphrases the foundational literature of the Islamic religion: the Qur’ān, the Ḥadīth collections, and other works containing Islamic Tradition.

In this the *Liber denudationis* is only the most vivid exemplar of a widespread tendency found in the Mozarabic sources studied here. For nearly all these treatises, fragments, and stray annotations contain evidence—often abundant evidence—that their authors were very familiar with these basic Islamic texts, and that

¹ *Liber denudationis* 1.2. Cf. the similar comments made by the author of the *Apology*: “You know . . . that we have not written to you anything beyond (*zīyādatan*) what is in [the Qur’ān] itself . . . and we have not affirmed as valid (*lam nuthbū*) anything but what is completely authentic (*al-ṣaḥīḥ*) from among that which your honest transmitters [of tradition] have handed down . . .” (*Risālat al-Kindī*, p. 139); cf. ch. 3, n. 118 above.

² See the commentary to my edition and translation below in part two.

they used this familiarity to substantially supplement what they had learned of Islam and how to confront it from the Oriental Arab-Christian tradition. Hence, even as these Mozarabic apologists were frequently consulting Oriental-Christian books like the *Apology of al-Kindī* as they wrote, it is certain in many cases that they also had copies of the Qur'ān, Qur'ānic commentaries, and Ḥadīth collections open next to them as well.

It is hardly surprising, of course, that these Andalusī authors frequently quote the Qur'ān in their apologetic and polemical writings. Even non-Arabic-speaking European Christians in the Middle Ages recognized the centrality of the Qur'ān in Islam and the apologetic necessity of responding to its claims, and they did so at enormous length.³ Mozarabs, given their knowledge of Arabic and direct acquaintance with Islamic society, could hardly fail to have an even deeper understanding of both the role and contents of the Qur'ān. Of all the Islamic books which they drew upon, the Qur'ān is undoubtedly the most frequently cited; and they normally quote it with a fairly high degree of accuracy.

In general, like Christians everywhere and in almost every age, the Mozarabic apologists used the Qur'ān in two contradictory ways. On the one hand, they assiduously sought to expose what they saw as its obvious falseness. It was, they insisted, badly written, disorganized, and riddled with bald contradictions and bizarre fantasies,⁴ all this being the result—so they argued—of a variety of factors: Muḥammad was a false prophet who learned a distorted version of the Judeo-Christian scriptures from an heretical monk and heretical Jews; many of his visions were the epileptic fits of a madman; and what he actually uttered was, in any case, reworked and corrupted by his followers in the process of compiling the Qur'ān.⁵ But having vigorously—and usually dishonestly—argued

³ N. Daniel, *Islam and the West*, p. 33; for an overview of the medieval European approach to the Qur'ān in general, see *ibid.*, pp. 27-73.

⁴ See esp. *Liber denudationis* 7 & 9; al-Qūṭī in al-Khazraǧī 6-7, pp. 35-36; and the Annotator, *passim*, esp. 32rb rm c. ll. 4-8 ("de Saule et David fabula stulta"). Cf. *Risālat al-Kindī*, pp. 142-47, and N. Daniel, *Islam and the West*, pp. 57-67.

⁵ See *Liber denudationis* 5 & 6, and the Annotator 33ra rm c. ll. 13-19, 34vb, lm. c. ll. 26-33, 47va, lm. c. ll. 18-20, and esp. 57rb, rm. c. ll. 1-19. Ibn Ḥazm (*al-Faṣl* 2:209-10, M. Asín-Palacios, *Abenházam de Córdoba* 3:120-21) recorded a variety of Christian arguments against the validity of the Qur'ān,

that the revelation to Muḥammad was a counterfeit, these same Mozarabs did not hesitate to use passages of the Qur'ān which agreed in some way with the Christian scriptures in order to demonstrate the correctness of Christian doctrine. Thus, as we have seen, Mozarabs used the Qur'ān to demonstrate Jesus' divinity, the possibility of Incarnation, and the validity of the Christian scriptures themselves.⁶ In this contradictory use of the Qur'ān, the Mozarabs were in line with the general medieval-Christian view of the Qur'ān as Norman Daniel has described it: "On the surface, [they] thought, it was wholly alien to them . . . In so far as it [was], it was rejected. In so far as it could be used to forward the Christian cause, it was admitted as an authority."⁷

*

But for the purposes of understanding better the intellectual milieu of the Mozarabs, this typical Christian exploitation of the Qur'ān—which, incidentally, mirrored perfectly the corresponding Muslim approach to the Bible⁸—is much less interesting than the Mozarabic use of books containing the Ḥadīth, the large body of literature which makes up Islamic Tradition. For the Qur'ān, while foreign and objectionable to medieval Christians in content, was, nevertheless, readily recognizable to them as a revealed book: even though they believed it a fraud, they understood that generically it was more-or-less comparable to the Bible. But both the form and content of Islamic Tradition were almost wholly

many of them very much like those put forward in the above chapters of *Liber denudationis*. Cf. *Risālat al-Kindī*, pp. 127-41, and N. Daniel, *Islam and the West*, pp. 27-32.

⁶ See *Liber denudationis* 3.3-4, 10.8-17, and al-Qūfī in al-Khazrajī 3, p. 31.

⁷ N. Daniel, *Islam and the West*, p. 254.

⁸ One need cite no other example than Ibn Ḥazm's magisterial critique of the Old and New Testaments which at once relentlessly exposes their apparent contradictions and inconsistencies and unfailingly points up the passages which, for example, demonstrate that Jesus was only a prophet, as Muslims contended. See Ibn Ḥazm, *al-Faṣl*, 1:109-32, 177-329; 2:13-217, esp. 190ff.

alien to them. Not only did the Christian tradition possess nothing like the tens of thousands of short accounts—called *aḥādīth* (s. *hadīth*) or *akhbār* (s. *khavar*)—which related deeds and sayings of Muḥammad, but many of the characteristic features of this genre of religious literature were foreign to medieval Christians also. The *isnāds*—the chains of authoritative witnesses going back to the time of the Prophet and normally prefixed to each ḥadīth—must surely have struck medieval Christians as odd; and the unfamiliar subject matter of much of the Tradition, which ranged from Muḥammad's legal pronouncements to guidelines on how to fast and perform the Ḥajj to explanations of Qur'ānic verses, must likewise have puzzled them. Moreover, the individual ḥadīths were primarily preserved in Islamic books such as Ḥadīth collections and Qur'ānic commentaries whose principles of organization and scholarly conventions were in many cases unique to the Islamic milieu, and whose sheer bulk must often have seemed daunting to outsiders by itself. Yet Mozarabs frequently quote or paraphrase individual ḥadīths in the course of defending their beliefs and attacking Islam. Indeed, an examination of how these Arabic-speaking Christian apologists used these accounts makes it abundantly clear that they had a high degree of familiarity with this strictly and peculiarly Islamic genre of literature.

The individual ḥadīths that, as a body, make up the Ḥadīth or Islamic Tradition circulated throughout the Islamic world both in their originally oral form and in writing. Because of their overwhelming importance to Islamic piety, theology, and ritual, individual ḥadīths show up in a variety of Islamic books, most importantly in the large ninth-century collections of the ḥadīths deemed by Muslim scholars to be authentic, but also in related works such as commentaries on the Qur'ān, histories, and theological works. Even philosophic works quoted ḥadīths occasionally. Mozarabs would, in fact, have encountered ḥadīths regularly if they took the time to read many Islamic books. When the contemporary Andalusī Muslim philosopher Ibn Ṭufayl (d. 1185) quoted the Prophet as announcing that God says "I am his hearing by which he hears and his sense of sight by which he sees," he was quoting a genuine ḥadīth.⁹ So was al-Ghazālī (d. 1111) when, in the

⁹ "Kuntu sam'ahu alladhī yasma'ū bi-hi wa-baṣarahu alladhī bi-hi yabṣuru"

course of recommending the life of ascetic renunciation, he asserted that Muḥammad had said that "the poor of my nation will enter the garden of paradise before its rich by five hundred years."¹⁰ If they opened the widely-read book called *The Remedy for Explaining the Proper Rights of the Chosen [Prophet] (al-Shifā' bi-ta'rīf ḥuqūq al-Muṣṭafā)* which expounded the virtues of the Prophet and was written by the contemporary Andalusī Muslim Qāḍī 'Iyāḍ (d. 1149), they would have found ḥadīths on nearly every page.¹¹ Indeed, if they read any of the apologetic and polemical works written against Christianity by Andalusī Muslims, they would similarly have met ḥadīths.¹² It was only natural, therefore, that in confronting Islam intellectually, Mozarabs would eventually begin to draw on the copious Islamic Traditional literature for their own polemical purposes.

In fact, they possessed ready-made examples of the use of Islamic Tradition against the Muslims themselves in Oriental-Christian works such as the *Apology of al-Kindī*. The late Professor d'Alverny pointed out many years ago that Oriental Christians frequently mined the collections of Islamic Tradition for material which could be usefully reinterpreted or deformed in a way deemed useful to the Christian cause.¹³ The *Apology*—a work which, as we have seen, is thoroughly representative of the anti-Islamic tradition in Arabic—provides numerous examples, such as when its author observes that Muḥammad "testified about himself that women and perfume were dear to him."¹⁴ These words come

(Ibn Tufayl, *Ḥayy ibn Yaqzān*, p. 59 [Arabic], p. 57 [French]; cf. al-Bukhārī 81. 38. 2).

¹⁰ "Yadkhulu fuqarā' ummatī al-jannah qabla aghniyā' bi-khamsamī'ah 'ām" (al-Ghazālī, *Ihyā' 'ulūm al-dīn* 4, p. 230, sec. n. 4).

¹¹ There are several editions, the most recent being 'Iyāḍ b. Mūsā b. 'Iyāḍ al-Yaḥṣubī (Qāḍī 'Iyāḍ), *al-Shifā' bi-ta'rīf ḥuqūq al-Muṣṭafā*, ed. 'Alī Muḥammad al-Bajāwī, 2 vols., 1984, Beirut. So popular was this work that between the 14th and the 19th centuries over twenty commentaries were written on it; see W. Watt, *A History of Islamic Spain*, (1965), p. 134.

¹² See, e. g., al-Khazraǧī 71, 164, pp. 94-95, 190; and al-Qurṭubī, pp. 224, 251, and esp. pp. 348-387.

¹³ See d'Alverny, "La connaissance," p. 581.

¹⁴ "Yashhadu 'alā nafsīhi annahu ḥubbiba ilayhi al-ṭīb wa-al-nisā'" (*Risālat al-Kindī*, p. 81).

directly from a ḥadīth preserved by Ibn Ḥanbal,¹⁵ and are cited by the Christian author in order to illustrate Muḥammad's lustful character. This author is even acquainted with some of the terminology devised by Islamic scholars in their study of the Ḥadīth. When he objects that the tradition (*khavar*)¹⁶ which relates how Muḥammad stuck his hand into a pitcher (*mīdā'ah*) miraculously causing water to gush forth from it is "weak" (*da'if*),¹⁷ he is using the term applied by Ḥadīth scholars to ḥadīths which lack a valid chain of verifying authorities. He likewise adopted the terminology of the doctors of the Ḥadīth when he insisted that no Muslims deny the "soundness" (*ṣiḥḥah*) of the tradition which confirms that Muḥammad was not circumcised,¹⁸ "sound ḥadīths" being those accounts with impeccably valid *isnāds* or chains of verifying authorities.¹⁹

Moreover, the *Apology's* author seems to have read Qur'ānic commentaries which also preserve a great deal of Islamic Tradition. His polemical retelling of the seemingly unflattering adventure of 'Ā'ishah with Ṣafwān, for example, most likely is drawn from such a source, since he quotes both the Qur'ānic verse (24:11) for which those events are the occasion of revelation, and the Traditional version of the story itself, as if he were reading a commentary on that verse as he wrote.²⁰ ʿIlīyā al-Naṣībī, the Nestorian bishop contemporary with our sources, drew polemically on such commentaries in more explicit fashion. He, for example, argued energetically against a Muslim friend that "Christians who believe in God and the Last Day and believe in the resurrection . . . after death . . . stand in no fear of what they will come to in the way of the horrors of the general resurrec-

¹⁵ "Inna al-nabī . . . qāla, ḥubbiba ilayya al-nisā' wa-al-ṭīb" (Ibn Ḥanbal 3, p. 199). This ḥadīth also appears in the *Liber denudationis* in a slightly fuller form in 9.22.

¹⁶ The *Apology's* author, like many early Muslims, uses *khavar* consistently where later Sunnī Muslims would use the term *ḥadīth*; see "Khabar," EI² 4:895 [art. A. Wensinck], and E. Lane, *An Arabic-English Lexicon* 2, p. 696a.

¹⁷ *Risālat al-Kindī*, pp. 107-08.

¹⁸ *Risālat al-Kindī*, p. 162.

¹⁹ On the terminology of Ḥadīth criticism see "Ḥadīth," EI² 3:23-28 [art. J. Robson].

²⁰ See *Risālat al-Kindī*, pp. 82-83; cf. al-Ṭabarī on 24:11, 18, pp. 90ff.

tion,” here citing explicitly and closely paraphrasing parts of al-Ṭabarī’s commentary on verse 2:62.²¹

*

But if the Mozarabs did not invent this approach to anti-Islamic polemic—indeed, they probably borrowed it from Oriental-Christian works such as the *Apology* from which they learned so much—it was, nevertheless, a technique that they cultivated directly and with particular relish: searching Ḥadīth collections, commentaries, and other texts for traditions which were potentially embarrassing to the Prophet and his religion. One apologist, the author of *Tathlīth al-waḥdāntiyah*, actually mentions one of the great Ḥadīth collections explicitly. Addressing his Islamic audience in general, he pointed out that “We do not accept on your behalf [anything] from the prophecies and narrated tales as attested by Muslim in his book.”²² Here he is referring to Muslim ibn al-Ḥajjāj’s *Ṣaḥīḥ*, one of the six authoritative Ḥadīth collections.

There is evidence, moreover, that Mozarabs were using Islamic Tradition in this polemical fashion as early as the mid-eleventh century, for in the course of deriding Jesus’ prophecy of his early return as recorded in Matthew 10:23, Ibn Ḥazm of Cordoba remarked that a Christian might say that

in one of your genuine ḥadīths [it is recorded] that your Prophet said while pointing to a boy . . . from the Banū al-Najjār that “if this [boy] lives a full life, then he will live to see the Hour [of Judgement],” but that boy died at the end of adolescence; and that when he was speaking to some Bedouins they asked him, “when will the Hour [of Judgement] occur?” and he said, while pointing to the youngest of them, that “if this [boy] reaches maturity, death will

²¹ “al-Naṣārā man āmana bi-Allāh wa-al-yawm al-ākhir wa-ṣaddaqa bi-al-ba’th . . . ba’da al-mawt . . . fa-lā khawf ‘alay-him fī-mā qadamū ‘alay-hi min ahwāl al-qiyyamah” (Īlīyā al-Naṣībī, “al-Majlis al-thāthith,” p. 120; cf. al-Ṭabarī on 2:62; 1, pp. 317-18, and esp. pp. 320-21).

²² “Lā naqbalu la-ka min al-nubūwāt wa-al-riwāyāt al-marwīyāt ‘an Muslim fī kitābihi” (*Tathlīth al-waḥdāntiyah* in al-Qurṭubī, p. 215).

not come over him until the Hour occurs.”²³

The point of a Christian bringing up this statement of the Prophet in disputation with a Muslim would be, presumably, to make clear that if Jesus made ambiguous prophecies about the end of the world, so did Muḥammad. In any case, Ibn Ḥazm immediately responds to this argument by asserting that “If they say this,” all one need do is show that this particular ḥadīth is inauthentic.²⁴ However, despite Ibn Ḥazm’s insistence on this ḥadīth’s inauthenticity, very similar variations of it can be found in at least one early collection, that of Ibn Ḥanbal. According to him Anas reported that

a man asked the Apostle of God . . . when the Hour [of Judgement] would occur while there was with him a boy from among the Anṣārī who was called Muḥammad; so the Apostle of God . . . said to him ‘if this boy lives, then perhaps senility will not come over him until the Hour occurs.’²⁵

The ḥadīth which Ibn Ḥazm placed in the mouth of a contemporaneous Mozarab was, therefore, a ḥadīth which resembled closely one well-known in Islamic tradition. The fact that Ibn Ḥanbal’s version is somewhat different from that set forth by Ibn Ḥazm is not unusual: some ḥadīths are known in at least thirty slightly different forms.²⁶

Now as I mentioned in chapter two, when Ibn Ḥazm prefaces a statement—as he does here—with “If the Christians say . . .” it is never clear whether he is setting forth an argument which he has

²³ “Fa-in qālū fa-inna fī ṣaḥīḥ ḥadīthikum anna nabīyakum . . . qāla wa-ashāra ilā ghulām . . . min banī al-Najjār in istakmala hādḥā ‘umrahu adraka al-sā‘ah fa-māta dhālika al-ghulām fī ḥadd al-ṣibā wa-annahu kāna yaqūlu lil-a‘rāb idhā sa‘alū matā taqūmu al-sā‘ah fa-yushūru ilā aṣgharihim wa-yaqūlu in istakmala hādḥā ‘umrahu lam ya’tihī al-mawt ḥattā taqūma al-sā‘ah” (Ibn Ḥazm, *al-Faṣl* 2:59-60, M. Asín-Palacios, *Abenházam de Córdoba* 3:46-47).

²⁴ Ibn Ḥazm employed very strict standards in Ḥadīth criticism, and in disputation with other Muslims he was particularly fond of the tactic of invalidating the ḥadīths they used to substantiate their views; see “Ibn Ḥazm,” *EI*² 3:795 [art. R. Arnaldez].

²⁵ “. . . ‘an Anas ibn Mālik anna rajulan sa‘ala rasūl Allāh . . . matā taqūmu al-sā‘ah wa-‘inda-hu ghulām min al-Anṣārī yuqālu la-hu Muḥammad fa-qāla la-hu rasūl Allāh . . . in ya‘īsh hādḥā al-ghulām fa-‘asā an lā yudrikahu al-harim ḥattā taqūma al-sā‘ah” (Ibn Ḥanbal 3, p. 228, cf. p. 213).

²⁶ For an example see A. Guillaume, *The Traditions of Islam*, p. 15.

actually heard a Christian use or merely proposing an argument which he thinks they might use. We cannot, therefore, be certain that a Christian ever used this particular ḥadīth in a religious discussion with a Muslim. Yet the fact that Ibn Ḥazm suggests that Mozarabs might draw on Islam's vast Traditional literature for polemical purposes indicates that they probably had already done so; for using this corpus of Islamic traditions against Islam itself is a polemical strategy that is not immediately obvious either to non-Muslims who could benefit from it or to Muslims who might suffer as a result. It presupposes not only a sophisticated understanding of how central this literature is in Islam but also some practical knowledge of how to use the ḥadīth collections and other traditional sources. In short, it is hard to imagine Ibn Ḥazm mentioning that Christians might cite such a potentially troubling ḥadīth if, in fact, they had not already done so.

*

While there is no way to determine with certainty from the text itself whether a Christian actually quoted from this Islamic Traditional literature in disputation with Ibn Ḥazm, the evidence from the next century suggests that this is very likely. All but two of our twelfth-century texts clearly incorporate ḥadīths which their authors extracted from the main collections, the Qur'ānic commentaries, or other Islamic texts.²⁷

In addition to mentioning the great Ḥadīth scholar Muslim ibn Ḥajjāj by name, the author of *Tathlīth al-waḥdāntyah* actually quotes at least four ḥadīths in full, and the evidence suggests that this author found at least two of these ḥadīths in one of the Ḥadīth collections. His first quotation of Islamic Tradition occurs in the course of his demonstration of the possibility of incarnation.²⁸ Here, while pointing out that on the day of judgement the one who

²⁷ *The Letter of al-Qūṭī* and the fragments attributed to Aghushūn are the two sources which do not appear to make direct use of Islamic texts containing ḥadīths.

²⁸ This demonstration is discussed at length in the previous chapter.

judges mankind will be perceivable by human senses, he observes that "Your lord (i. e. Muḥammad) said, 'you will see your Lord, and you will have no difficulty in seeing the moon on the night when it is full.'"²⁹ This is a garbled version of a ḥadīth of which al-Bukhārī records several versions, including the following on the authority of Jarīr: "The messenger of God came to us on the night of the full moon and said, 'You will see your Lord on the day of resurrection just as you see this; you will have no difficulty in seeing Him.'"³⁰ Interestingly enough, when the Muslim al-Qurṭubī responds to this passage of *Tathlīth al-waḥdānīyah*, he points out that the Christian author has got the text wrong and provides a corrected version similar to that just quoted from al-Bukhārī.³¹

When the Mozarabic author of *Tathlīth al-waḥdānīyah* challenges his Muslim readers to establish the validity of their faith on the basis of the Torah and Gospel (just as he has defended Christianity on the basis of the words of the Hebrew prophets), he likewise quotes a ḥadīth. Christians do not accept the validity of the Qur'ān, he points out, so "If you mention anything from your book (i. e. the Qur'ān), I will say to you, just as your apostle said, 'Evidence belongs to whomever accuses; <only> an oath is necessary for him who denies.'"³² Again al-Bukhārī provides a clearer version of the same statement in the section of his collection devoted to the Islamic law regarding loans. In cases of dispute between a lender and borrower, "Evidence is necessary for the plaintiff and <only> an oath is required for the defendant."³³

Now these two ḥadīths quoted by the author of the *Tathlīth al-waḥdānīyah* are short enough and sufficiently garbled that it is

²⁹ "Inna rabbakum qāla, 'tarawna rabbakum wa-lā tuḍāmūna fī ru'yat al-qamar laylat al-badr'" (*Tathlīth al-waḥdānīyah* in al-Qurṭubī, pp. 116-17).

³⁰ "Kharaja 'alaynā rasūl Allāh . . . laylat al-badr fa-qāla, 'Innakum satarawna rabbakum yawm al-qiyyamah kamā tarawna hadhā; lā tuḍāmūna fī ru'yatīhi'" (al-Bukhārī 97. 24. 3, cf. P. Devillard, "Thèse sur al-Qurṭubī [translation]," p. 110, n. 3).

³¹ See al-Qurṭubī, p. 125.

³² "Fa-in qulta min kitābika shay'an qultu la-ka kamā qāla rasūluka, 'al-bayyinah li-man idda'ā wa-al-yamīn 'alā man ankara'" (*Tathlīth al-waḥdānīyah* in al-Qurṭubī, p. 215).

³³ "Fa-al-bayyinah 'alā al-mudda'ī wa-al-yamīn 'alā al-mudda'ā 'alayhi" (al-Bukhārī 48. 6. 1-2).

perfectly possible that their source was an oral one; the second in particular could have been heard by its author in a court proceeding, for example. But the other two traditions quoted by this author were almost surely taken from some written source. Just one paragraph after the quotation of the tradition on disputes between borrowers and lenders, this Mozarabic author quotes a ḥadīth with a complete *isnād* prefacing it:

Sufyān related on the authority of al-Zuhrī on the authority of Qatādah on the authority of ‘Ā’ishah who said the wife of Rifā’ah came to the Apostle and she said to him, “I belonged to Rifā’ah, but he divorced me, so I married ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn al-Zubayr.” But the Apostle smiled jestingly and said, “Do you want to return to Rifā’ah? [You cannot] until you taste his sweetness and ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Zubayr tastes your sweetness.”³⁴

“To taste someone’s sweetness” is a euphemism for “to have sexual intercourse with;”³⁵ the point of the ḥadīth, therefore, is to illustrate the divorce law (which I discussed in chapter three) which requires that a woman who has been properly divorced by means of the three-fold repetition of the *ṭalāq* cannot return to her original husband until she consummates a marriage with another man first and is subsequently divorced from him. Our author, therefore, quotes this ḥadīth in order to demonstrate to his Christian readers how thoroughly un-Christian the marriage practices of Islam are. This particular ḥadīth can be found in nearly this form, with almost the same *isnād*, in the collections of both Ibn Ḥanbal and al-Bukhārī.³⁶

The final ḥadīth quoted by this author follows this third one directly and is really just another version of it. This time the Christian leaves off most of the *isnād* saying only that

³⁴ “Ḥaddathanā Sufyān ‘an al-Zuhrī ‘an Qatādah ‘an ‘Ā’ishah qālat jā’at imra’at Rifā’ah ilā al-rasūl fa-qālat la-hu: kuntu li-Rifā’ah fa-tallaqanī fa-tazawwajtu ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn al-Zubayr. Fa-tabassama al-rasūl dāḥikan wa-qāla: a-turīdīna an tarjī’ī ilā Rifā’ah? lā ḥattā tadhūqī ‘asilatahu wa-yadhūqa ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Zubayr ‘asilataki” (*Taḥlūh al-waḥdānīyah* in al-Qurṭubī, p. 215).

³⁵ See E. Lane, *An Arabic-English Lexicon* 5, p. 2046 c. 3 who by coincidence uses this very ḥadīth to explain the meaning of ‘asilah (“sweetness”), and in proper Victorian fashion observes that the Arab grammarians say that it means “the sweetness or deliciousness of *jimā’*”; *jimā’*, which he leaves untranslated, means “sexual intercourse.”

³⁶ See al-Bukhārī 52. 3. 2 and Ibn Ḥanbal 6, pp. 37-38.

In another tale [related] on the authority of ‘Ā’ishah she said: “A man pronounced the three-fold divorce of his wife, so [another] man married her [but] then divorced her before he slept with her and her first husband wanted to [re]marry her, so he asked the Apostle about that. He said, ‘Not until the other [man] tastes of her sweetness what the first man has tasted.’”³⁷

A ḥadīth very similar to this and also related on ‘Ā’ishah’s authority can be found in al-Bukhārī’s collection.³⁸

The fact that the author of *Tathlīth al-waḥdāntiyah* has quoted these last two ḥadīths with a whole and partial *isnād* respectively indicates that he has taken them from some written Islamic text particularly concerned with Islamic tradition such as a Ḥadīth collection or a Qur’ānic commentary; for it is in such works that *isnāds* are almost invariably attached to each ḥadīth, while in many other Islamic texts the *isnāds* are often left off.³⁹ The most likely source is a Ḥadīth collection, since these two traditions are not quoted in conjunction with any Qur’ānic verse (something we will often see in other works), and since the easiest way to find such ḥadīths relating to Islamic marriage law would be to open up one of the authoritative collections to the section on marriage.

Moreover, these last two quotations of Islamic tradition by the author of *Tathlīth al-waḥdāntiyah* provide striking evidence in support of one of the main conclusions of the last chapter: that although the Mozarabic polemicists were heavily indebted to earlier Oriental Arab-Christian apologetic works, they were not slavishly reliant on the *Apology of al-Kindī* or, apparently, any

³⁷ “Wa-ḥi riwāyah ukhrā ‘an ‘Ā’ishah qālat: ṭallaqa rajul imra’atan thalāthatan fa-tazawwajahā rajul thumma ṭallaqahā qabla an yadkhula bi-hā wa-arāda zawjuhā al-awwal an yatazawwajahā fa-sa’ala al-rasūl ‘an dhālika. Qāla: lā ḥattā yadhūqa al-ākhar min ‘asīlatihā mā dhāqa al-awwal” (*Tathlīth al-waḥdāntiyah* in al-Qurṭubī, p. 215).

³⁸ See al-Bukhārī 68. 4. 3. Though the Christian author of *Tathlīth al-waḥdāntiyah* seems to indicate that these two ḥadīths are from Muslim’s collection, I have not been able to find them in his chapter on *ṭalāq*. However, there is at least one tradition recorded there that has the same basic thrust; see Muslim 17 (*ṭalāq*); 10, p. 62.

³⁹ For example, the ḥadīths quoted by Ibn Ṭufayl and al-Ghazālī and cited above were quoted by these Muslim authors without *isnāds*. Moreover, al-Qurṭubī never gives whole *isnāds* for the many traditions he cites in his response to *Tathlīth al-waḥdāntiyah*; see al-Qurṭubī, pp. 224, 251, and esp. pp. 348-387.

other such treatise for much of their detailed information about Islam. For while attacking the same Islamic marriage law, the Oriental author of the *Apology of al-Kindī* also quotes a ḥadīth whose kernel is the same as these last two, but he does so without any *isnād* or other indication of which companion of the prophet originally recounted it. While, therefore, the author of *Tathlith al-wahdāntiyah* may have followed the *Apology* in this general argument, he got the particular versions of this ḥadīth elsewhere, in this case probably a Ḥadīth collection.

*

While the four ḥadīths cited in *Tathlith al-wahdāntiyah* appear to have been found in the Ḥadīth collections themselves or were simply heard orally, other Mozarabic sources contain evidence that their authors had extracted such Traditional information specifically from Qur'ānic commentaries. The most intriguing examples of this practice are certain passages in the Latin commentary written by the anonymous Annotator in the margins of Robert of Ketton's Latin translation of the Qur'ān. Now this exegetical material *could* conceivably have been obtained from a variety of books containing Islamic Tradition. Yet it is most striking that both the Annotator and the Qur'ānic commentators frequently set forth precisely the same exegetical material, drawn ultimately from the Ḥadīth, in the course of their respective explications of the same verses. This repeated, vivid similarity of content can hardly be accounted for other than by assuming that the Annotator had some Qur'ānic commentary open next to him as he wrote his anti-Islamic, Latin commentary on the Qur'ān.

An example that is as revealing as it is concise can be found in an interlinear gloss attached to verse 3:24, where the Qur'ān mentions those who, having turned away from the Book, claimed that the fires of Gehenna would not touch them "except for a predetermined number of days" (*nisi numero dierum preterminato*, translating *illā ayyāman ma'dūdātin*). Here the Annotator observes that this predetermined period is "forty days" (*scilicet diebus*

x/).⁴⁰ Now there is nothing nearby within the text of the Qur'ān itself to suggest that this is the number and the incident is not famous enough to have warranted widespread attention. Al-Ṭūṣī (d. 1067), however, notes in his commentary on this same passage that some interpreters say that this predetermined period is equal to "the [number of] days in which they (the Israelites) worshiped the calf, and that is forty days."⁴¹

A second example occurs at verse 2:243 where the Qur'ān invokes the memory of those who quitted their dwellings for fear of death only to have God call death down upon them anyway and then restore them to life again. The Annotator explains that "according to some this happened to certain people fleeing lest they go into battle."⁴² Among the explanations given by al-Ṭabarī (d. 923) for this passage is that they "went out fleeing from battle on behalf of God."⁴³

The Annotator's comment on verse 2:185 provides a third and more extensive example. Here Robert of Ketton's version of the Qur'ān reads in part as follows: ". . . manifestly in the month of Ramaḍān in which this law-bearing book . . . was given from heaven."⁴⁴ In the margin, however, the Annotator has written that Muḥammad

says that the book was given to him from heaven in the month of Ramaḍān because according to them (i. e. the Muslims) the first chapter was given then and consequently the whole book was given chapter by chapter.⁴⁵

⁴⁰ Annotator, fol. 34va, interlinearly ll. 33-34.

⁴¹ "Hiya al-ayyām allatī 'abadū fī-hā al-ʿijl wa-hiya arbaʿūna yauman" (al-Ṭūṣī on 3:24; 2, p. 426). As al-Ṭūṣī observes, *ibid.*, other traditions say that the number of days was seventy. Cf. al-Ṭabarī on 2:80 (where the same verse appears), 1, pp. 380-84; and Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Qurṭubī on 2:80, 2, pp. 10-11.

⁴² "Secundum quosdam istud contigit quibusdam fugientibus ne ad prelium irent" (Annotator, fol. 32rb, top margin).

⁴³ "Kharajū firāran min al-jihād fī sabīl Allāh" (al-Ṭabarī on v. 2:243; 2, pp. 586-87, 590).

⁴⁴ "Uidelicet mense romadan in quo liber hic legifer . . . celitus est datus" (*Lex Mahumet*, fol. 30rb, ll. 6-8). The Latin reflects the Arabic text fairly accurately.

⁴⁵ "Dicit sibi librum datum celitus in mense romadan quia secundum illos tunc primum capitulum datum fuit et consequenter capitulatim datus est liber totus" (Annotator, fol. 30rb rm c. ll. 6-8).

Once again there is nothing in the text of the Qur'ān to supply this sort of information, but we do find it in the commentaries on the same passage. Al-Ṭabarī, for example, explains that the words "the month of Ramaḍān in which the Qur'ān was revealed" (*shahr ramadan alladhi unzila fi-hi al-Qur'ān*) mean that the text of the Qur'ān descended from the tablets where it is preserved (*al-lawḥ al-mahfūz*) in the highest heaven to the terrestrial heaven (*samā' al-dunyā*); it was then revealed to Muḥammad little by little in accordance with God's will.⁴⁶ After this general explanation, al-Ṭabarī then quotes many ḥadīths which provide evidence of this view. One ḥadīth, for example, explains that the Qur'ān descended whole to the terrestrial heaven "and then God . . . revealed it to Muḥammad after that . . . section by section."⁴⁷ Al-Ṭūsī provides much the same account, observing that the Qur'ān "was revealed to the Prophet after this in installments."⁴⁸ Here, therefore, is the source for this extra information added by the Annotator, his *capitulatim* ("chapter by chapter") translating nicely the Muslim commentators' *rasalan rasalan* ("section by section") and *nujūman* ("in installments").

The Annotator's comments on 3:54 where Jesus' apparent crucifixion is mentioned are a similarly telling example. Here God explains, as Robert of Ketton paraphrases it, that "The fraudulent ones trying to deceive him [i. e. Jesus] are, rather, made sport of by Him just as by a shrewder one."⁴⁹ After first noting interlinearly that the "fraudulent ones" (*fraudenti*) mentioned here are "the Jews" (*iudei scilicet*),⁵⁰ the Annotator explains in the margin that

Here [Muḥammad] means to say that certain Jews wanted to kill Christ but, shrewdly removing Himself, He escaped, leaving I know not whom in His place, whom they crucified, thinking that he was Christ. But the Creator raised Christ to Himself.⁵¹

⁴⁶ al-Ṭabarī on 2:185; 2, p. 144.

⁴⁷ "Thumma nazzala . . . Allāh 'alā Muḥammad ba'da dhālika . . . rasalan rasalan" (al-Ṭabarī on 2:185; 2, p. 145).

⁴⁸ "Thumma unzila 'alā al-nabī ba'da dhālika nujūman" (al-Ṭūsī on 2:185; 2, pp. 121-22; cf. al-Zamakhsharī's similar statement on 2:185; 1, p. 227).

⁴⁹ "Fraudenti uero eum decipere nitentes ab ipso uelud a callidiorē potius delusi sunt" (*Lex Mahumet*, fol. 35va, ll. 9-11).

⁵⁰ Annotator, fol. 35rv, interlinearly, ll. 8-9.

⁵¹ "Hic uult dicere quod iudei quidem Christum uoluerunt occidere sed ipse

Now although the Qur'ān clearly indicates that Jesus did not really die on the cross but only appeared to, it does not make clear exactly what did happen to Him. Islamic Tradition, however, supplies many of these details in various ways. In particular, some later Muslims held that Christ was replaced by someone else who was crucified for Him.⁵² Al-Ṭabarī, for example, in his commentary on this same verse explains that those who were trying to deceive, but who were in the end deceived themselves, were "some of the Israelites" (*min banī Isrā'īl*) whose deceit was "the agreement of some of them with others upon the attacking and killing of Jesus."⁵³ He then quotes a number of ḥadīths which explain this further. One, for example, relates that

The Israelites surrounded Jesus and nineteen of the disciples in a house; but Jesus said to his companions, 'Who will take my image so that he will be killed and have Paradise?' One of the men took it, and Jesus was raised up to heaven . . . But when the disciples came out [the Jews] saw that they were [only] nineteen, so [the disciples] informed them that Jesus had been raised up to heaven. So [the Jews] began to count the group and they found them lacking in one man from the [original] number, and they saw [the man with] the image of Jesus among them, so they were in doubt about it. But despite this they killed and crucified the man since they judged that he was Jesus.⁵⁴

Here clearly is a ḥadīth containing all the extra information supplied by the Annotator, and it is quoted by al-Ṭabarī in his commentary on precisely the same passage as the Annotator is explain-

callide se subtrahens euasit dimittens nescio quem loco sui quem crucifixerunt putantes illum esse Christum. Creator autem levavit Christum ad se" (Annotator, fol. 35va, lm c. ll. 10-13).

⁵² See "Īsā," EI² 4:83-84 [art. G. Anawati]; see also the very helpful study by Neal Robinson, *Christ in Islam and Christianity*, pp. 117-41.

⁵³ "Muwāṭa'at ba'ḍihim ba'ḍan 'alā al-fatḥ bi-Īsā wa-qatlihi" (al-Ṭabarī on 3:54; 3, p. 288).

⁵⁴ "Inna banī Isrā'īl ḥaṣarū Īsā wa-tis'ah 'ashr rajulan min al-ḥawārīyīn fī bayt fa-qāla Īsā li-aṣḥābihi, 'man ya'khudhu ṣūratī fa-yuqṭalu wa-la-hu al-jannah' fa-ya'khudhuhā rajul minhum wa-ṣu'ida bi-Īsā ilā al-samā' . . . fa-lammā kharaja al-ḥawārīyūn abṣarūhum tis'ah 'ashar fa-akhbarūhum anna Īsā qad ṣu'ida bi-hi ilā al-samā' fa-ja'alū ya'uddūna al-qawm fa-yajidūnahum yanquṣūna rajulan min al-'addah wa-yarawna ṣūrat Īsā fī-him fa-shakkū fī-hi wa-'alā dhalika qatalū al-rajul wa-hum yarawna annahu Īsā wa-ṣalabūhu" (al-Ṭabarī on 3:54; 3, p. 289). See also *Liber denudationis* 10.22 where parts of this same account are quoted.

ing. Other commentaries on this verse provide similar information.⁵⁵

One final example indicates that not only was the Annotator using a Qur'ānic commentary as he polemically explicated the text of the first few sūrahs, but so also, surprisingly, was the Englishman Robert of Ketton as he translated them. Just a few lines above this marginal annotation describing how Jesus was said to have appointed a stand-in to be crucified for Him on the cross, the Annotator comments on the name given in the Islamic world to the disciples of Jesus. This comes up in connection with verse 3:52 wherein Jesus asks, "‘Who will be my helpers in the cause of God?’ The disciples said, ‘We are the helpers of God.’" Now the Arabic word used for "disciples" here is *al-Ḥawārīyūn* which is simply the Ethiopic word for "the disciples." The Qur'ānic commentators, however, believed that it was from the Arabic root *HWR* which, among other things, could mean (in the second form) "to make white;" and there were several explanations typically given for why the disciples were referred to by means of a word from this root.⁵⁶ According to al-Ṭabarī some say Jesus' disciples were called *al-Ḥawārīyūn* "on account of the whiteness of their clothes" (*li-bayāḍ thiyābihim*), while others said it was because they were "fullers who died clothes white" (*kānū qaṣṣārīn yubayyidūna al-thiyāb*), while still others believed that they were called this because they were "the elite and select of the prophets" (*hum khāṣṣat al-anbiyā' wa-ṣafwatuhum*). Some combination of the first two explanations seemed most convincing to al-Ṭabarī.⁵⁷

Now when Robert of Ketton translated this verse, he did not use *discipuli* or *apostoli* to translate *al-Ḥawārīyūn* as we might expect. Instead he merely replaced the word with one of the explanations put forth by the commentators. "‘Who will follow me in the name of God?’" Jesus says in Robert of Ketton's paraphrased translation of the verse; "*Certain men dressed in white*

⁵⁵ See, e. g., Ibn Kathīr on 3:52-54, 1, p. 547.

⁵⁶ See E. Lane, *An Arabic-English Lexicon* 2, pp. 665-66; cf. "Ḥawārī," EI² 3:285 [art. A. Wensinck].

⁵⁷ Al-Ṭabarī on 3:52; 3, pp. 287-88; cf. Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Qurṭubī on 3:52; 4, pp. 97-98.

clothes responded saying ‘We are your followers . . .’⁵⁸ What was originally an explanation provided by the commentators has now, therefore, become part of the text of the first Latin translation of the Qur’ān.⁵⁹

Then, when the Annotator came to this passage, he felt obligated to explain it for the Latin readers of the Qur’ān, and did so by adding even more information drawn from the commentaries. “[Muḥammad] wants the apostles of Christ to be understood as the men dressed in white clothes,” he explains, because he fears to name them by their proper names. Furthermore, “He wants to call them the men dressed in white on account of their sanctity.”⁶⁰ Not only, therefore, does he know from the Arabic commentaries that these “certain men dressed in white” are the disciples of Jesus—there is nothing in the Latin text by itself to make this clear—but he has added one other piece of information: that they are called this because of their sanctity. This reflects al-Ṭabarī’s third explanation of the origin of the Qur’ānic term *al-Ḥawārīyūn*, that they were among the elite of the prophets, as it was reformulated by later commentators. Al-Bayḍāwī (d. 1282), for example, observed that the disciples are called *al-Ḥawārīyūn* “on account of the purity of their intention and the holiness of their inmost thoughts” (*li-khulūṣ nīyatihim wa-naqā’ sarīratihim*).⁶¹

Therefore, just as Robert used a Qur’ānic commentary as he translated this passage, so too did the Annotator as he interpreted it. In chapter one I pointed out that the Mozarabic community in

⁵⁸ “‘Quis in dei nomine me sequetur?’ Uiri quidem albis induti uestibus respondentes dixerunt, ‘Nos . . . te sequentes’” (*Lex Mahumet*, 35va, ll. 3-6).

⁵⁹ This example of the interpolation of material from the Qur’ānic commentaries into Robert’s translation of the Qur’ān is probably not an isolated phenomenon, and is one of the many features of this remarkable translation that badly need extensive study, another being his highly unusual tendency to paraphrase rather than translate literally as was the custom in his day (see D. Lindberg, “The Transmission of Greek and Arabic Learning,” p. 78, and T. Glick, *Islamic and Christian Spain in the Early Middle Ages*, pp. 273-74).

⁶⁰ “Viros uestibus albis indutos apostolos Christi uult intelligi . . . vestibus albis indutos propter sanctitatem eorum uult dicere” (Annotator, 35va, lm c. ll. 2-6).

⁶¹ al-Bayḍāwī on 3:45, 1:157; cf. Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Qurṭubī on 3:52; 4, p. 98.

and around Toledo was a surprisingly cosmopolitan one, made up not only of Mozarabs in the strict sense but also of converted Arabic-speaking Jews, converted Muslims, and a certain number of European Christians who had learned Arabic and even given their children Arabic names. Robert's use of Qur'ānic commentaries as he translated, therefore, is not only representative of the general Mozarabic polemical use of Islamic Tradition, but is an intellectual expression of this remarkable cosmopolitanism.

*

The author of *Liber denudationis* likewise quotes Traditional material drawn from Qur'ānic commentaries. But this is only one of the paths by which he has come across the Islamic traditions that he then uses polemically, for his treatise contains at least twenty-five direct and indirect quotations of the Ḥadīth, some learned orally perhaps, others apparently coming from the large collections, still others derived from Qur'ānic commentaries. The title of his book in English is *The Book of Denuding or Exposing, or the Discloser*. His "denuding" and "exposing" of the nature of Islam, therefore, often consist of using a variety of Islamic traditions to point up what he sees as its licentiousness, bellicosity, and internal contradictions.⁶²

Sometimes what turn out to be almost direct quotations of ḥadīths which can be traced to the authoritative collections or Qur'ānic commentaries or other sources are placed in the text of *Liber denudationis* with no indication at all of their origin other than the content or nature of the passage itself. In these instances we have no real way of determining in what sort of Arabic book the Mozarabic author found these traditions or whether he did not, in fact, learn them orally. At the beginning of the fourth chapter,

⁶² It will be remembered in this connection that, although other scholars have doubted his sincerity, this author claims to be a converted Muslim. His considerable familiarity with Islamic Tradition is suggestive but, as should be obvious from the foregoing, inconclusive evidence of the validity of this claim; see chapter two above, pp. 53-55.

for example, the author asserts that since Muḥammad's prophethood was attested by neither scripture nor miracle, he was compelled to use force saying,

God ordered me to attack the nations with the sword until they testify that there is no god but God, and that I am His messenger; if they have confessed this thing, they have saved their blood and their property.⁶³

Now almost exactly these words can be found, for example, in Muslim's collection in a ḥadīth related on the authority of 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Umar, who said that

The Apostle of God . . . said, "I was commanded that I battle against mankind until they testify that there is no god except God and that Muḥammad is the Apostle of God and [until] they perform prayer and give alms, and when they do so, they will preserve safely from me their blood and their property."⁶⁴

The Christian author of *Liber denudationis* has embellished the story a little—Muḥammad is to "conquer the nations with the sword" in his account, rather than the milder "battle against the people"—but in general he has followed the text of this well-known ḥadīth quite faithfully. But in the Latin text of *Liber denudationis* this tradition is not prefaced by an *isnād* or any other indication of what sort of book the author learned it from. In fact, other than the content of the statement itself, the reader has no way of knowing that this author has just quoted a tradition.⁶⁵

Other passages are introduced with language that at least makes clear that the source is a ḥadīth and that, at the same time, suggests the sort of Islamic book from which it may have been derived. The passage which I cited in chapter two in connection with the dating of *Liber denudationis* is a good example. Here the author notes that

Muḥammad is reported in verified accounts, on the authority of a certain Abimassar, to have said that before one hundred years had

⁶³ *Liber denudationis* 4.1.

⁶⁴ "Qāla rasūl Allāh . . . umirtu an uqātīla al-nās ḥattā yashhadū an lā ilāh illā Allāh wa-anna Muḥammadan rasūl Allāh wa-yuqīmū al-ṣalāh wa-yu'tū al-zakāh fa-idhā fa'alū 'aṣamū min-nī dimā'ahum wa-amwālahum" (Muslim 1 [*Imān*]; 1, p. 212; cf. al-Bukhārī 56. 102. 6 for a more abbreviated version of the same ḥadīth).

⁶⁵ For another example of this same form of quotation see, e. g., *Liber denudationis* 7.4 ("O Muḥammad, God hastened in your desire").

passed away nothing would be living on the surface of the earth.⁶⁶ The words “on the authority of a certain man named Abimassar,” which indicate the important ancient Muslim who originally recounted the tradition, make up exactly the sort of phrase that Muslim writers often prefix to a ḥadīth when they do not want to list the whole *isnād*.⁶⁷ Here, therefore, we have language which clearly indicates that the source is a ḥadīth; and, in fact, Ibn Ḥanbal preserves several versions of such a tradition, one of which reads as follows:

Abū Mas‘ūd entered upon ‘Alī . . . and [‘Alī] said, “You say [that] the Apostle of God . . . said, ‘100 [more] years will not have come over mankind before there will not be a born soul on earth,’” but the Apostle of God . . . only said, “100 [more] years will not have come over mankind before there will not be a born soul on earth from among those who live today.”⁶⁸

Here we have a disagreement over what the Prophet meant, but it is clear that “on the authority of Abū Mas‘ūd (=Abimassar⁶⁹)” the prophet did say just what our Mozarabic author reported.⁷⁰

When the author of *Liber denudationis* recounts how the fire of hell will ask God for more of the damned on the day of judgement, he likewise introduces the passage with language that suggests that the source is a ḥadīth:

Also according to an account which none of you doubt, <we know> that on the day of the general resurrection when God orders the sons of perdition to be thrown into the fire, the fire itself will

⁶⁶ *Liber denudationis* 9.23.

⁶⁷ al-Qurṭubī provides many examples of this, pp. 360 ff.

⁶⁸ “Dakhala Abū Mas‘ūd ‘alā ‘Alī . . . fa-qāla: anta al-qā’il qāla rasūl Allāh . . . lā ya’tū ‘alā al-nās mi’ah ‘ām wa-‘alā al-arḍ nafs manfūṣah innamā qāla rasūl Allāh . . . lā ya’tū ‘alā al-nās mi’ah ‘ām wa-‘alā al-arḍ nafs manfūṣah mimman huwa ḥayy al-yawm” (Ibn Ḥanbal 1, p. 93; cf. 2, p. 121). For this meaning of *manfūs* see E. Lane, *An Arabic-English Lexicon* 8, p. 2829, c. 3.

⁶⁹ The final *dāl* of Mas‘ūd is very easily mistaken for *rā’* in Arabic script, and the *u* in the transliterated second syllable of the same word is easily mistaken by Latin copyists for *a*. Hence from *Mas‘ūd* in Arabic we wind up with *-massar* in the Latin ms. (On this phenomenon see J. Latham, “Arabic into Medieval Latin,” pp. 30-39.)

⁷⁰ Another example of this pattern is the author’s quotation of a ḥadīth which describes the examination of the newly dead by Munkar and Nakīr, and which is related on the authority of Ṣufyān al-Thawrī (*Seffian Elthouri*) and ‘A’ishah (*Aiesse*); see *Liber denudationis* 9.17.

cry out and say, “Are there not more?” And as often as it says, “Are there more?” so often will more be thrown into it. And it will continue to call out until The Most High extends His foot to it and then it will be full.⁷¹

“An account which none of you doubt” (*de narratione nullus uestrum dubitat*⁷²) is a good definition of what a *ḥadīth ṣaḥīḥ* (“sound ḥadīth”) is, so it should come as no surprise that essentially these same events are recounted in several versions in al-Bukhārī’s collection.⁷³ The author of *Liber denudationis* frequently refers to what he calls “histories” (*historiae*) and “narratives” (*narrationes*) which relate various events in the Prophet’s life and which he says are well-known among the Muslims.⁷⁴ Such narratives of the deeds of the Prophet are undoubtedly Islamic traditions, *narratio* and *historia* probably translating *ḥadīth* (“account,” “tale,” “narrative”) and *khbar* (“news,” “story,” “histories” [esp. in the plural]) respectively.⁷⁵

In some instances, the author of *Liber denudationis*, like the author of *Taḥlīl al-waḥdānīyah*, includes whole *isnāds* when quoting the traditions of the Prophet. In the second chapter of the *Liber denudationis*, for example, the author records Muḥammad saying that his followers would split into seventy-three divisions of which only one would be saved, prefacing this statement with the following lines:

This narrative or history is known among them, and neither the learned man nor the ignorant reject it; it is written thus: ‘My father related to me, who said, Ahmed Elhassen son of Rasik related to me, who said, the father of Rikarak related to us, who said, Abdalla Son of Befir related to us, who said, Malik related to us from the son of Zahri, who said, I heard Muḥammad saying . . .’⁷⁶

⁷¹ *Liber denudationis* 10.17.

⁷² On my translation of this peculiar Latin sentence which reflects the original Arabic syntax rather too closely, see my commentary to *Liber denudationis* 10.17.

⁷³ See my commentary on *Liber denudationis* 10.17.

⁷⁴ E. g. *Liber denudationis* 2.2 where both terms are used: “Haec autem narratio siue historia nota est apud eos . . .”

⁷⁵ The verb *narro* whence *narratio*, for example, is defined in the contemporary *Glossarium*, p. 329, as *KhBR* IV.

⁷⁶ *Liber denudationis* 2.2. For the identification of at least some of the people mentioned here, see my commentary on this paragraph.

Though the Arabic names are rather garbled in the Latin transliteration, this is clearly an *isnād* of the kind which precedes each ḥadīth in the large collections of Ḥadīth, such as that of Muslim. This particular ḥadīth, in fact, can be found in at least two important Ḥadīth collections, those of Abū Dāwūd and Ibn Ḥanbal.⁷⁷ Several other quotations of the Ḥadīth in *Liber denudationis* are likewise prefixed by a whole *isnād*.⁷⁸

The quotations or paraphrases of Tradition prefixed by phrases such as “an account which none of you doubt” or partial *isnāds* could, of course, have come from a great variety of Islamic books, while those with whole *isnāds*, for the reasons mentioned above, probably came from the Ḥadīth collections. But like the Annotator, the author of *Liber denudationis* is also familiar with Qur’ānic commentaries, since a good number of the ḥadīths paraphrased or quoted in *Liber denudationis* almost certainly were extracted from such exegetical works. In these instances, both the structure and the language of his exposition so clearly parallel the typical structure and language of Arabic commentaries on the Qur’ān that it is very difficult to come to any other conclusion.

A good example of this occurs when this Mozarabic author of *Liber denudationis* quotes verses 66:1-2 at the beginning of chapter seven:

O prophet, why do you anathematize . . . those things which God has conceded regarding that which you seek, <that is>, to do the will of your wives . . .? God has already laid down a law for you so that you may break your oaths.⁷⁹

The author then observes that the “Interpretation of these two verses” (*Expositio . . . binus sententiae*) is the story of the Prophet’s love of Māriyah his Coptic servant (*Maria Jacobita*), who was given to him by al-Muqawqis the ruler of Egypt, and the dissension this caused among his wives. Moved by jealousy, two of Muḥammad’s wives burst in upon him when he was having sex with Māriyah (*cognoscens dictam Mariam*) and asked him if such actions befitted a prophet. Embarrassed, Muḥammad promised

⁷⁷ See the commentary to *Liber denudationis* 2.2.

⁷⁸ E. g., *Liber denudationis* 4.5 (Muḥammad’s reaction to the experience of revelation), and 9.16 (Muḥammad commenting on the size of the world).

⁷⁹ *Liber denudationis* 7.1.

that he would never see her again, but later when he was not able to keep himself from her, he said, “the Lord made < this verse > descend upon me in regard to [Māriyah]” (*descendere fecit Dominus super me pro Maria*); at which point the two verses are then restated, though in a slightly different translation,⁸⁰ the author concluding this account by observing that thus Muḥammad showed himself to be a perjurer.⁸¹

The whole cast of these observations strongly suggests that the Christian author was relying on a Qur’ānic commentary in the writing of this passage. He quotes the two verses first, and then follows these by an “interpretation” (*expositio*) of what the two verses mean, and then restates the verses themselves. This basic order of exposition is followed time after time in the Arabic commentaries, wherein difficult Qur’ānic passages are typically explained by the quotation of ḥadīths which describe the occasion of the revelation of the verses, and in the course of these ḥadīths themselves the verses in question are often restated.⁸² In *expositio*, moreover, we have a Latin word which, according to the contemporary *Glossarium arabico-latinum*, corresponds precisely to the Arabic word *ta’wīl* meaning “interpretation,” or “explanation” and used repeatedly in this sense in the Qur’ānic commentaries themselves.⁸³

Turning, therefore, to al-Ṭabarī’s commentary on these verses, we are told, after these verses have been cited as the lemma to be commented on, that there is disagreement about what the thing was which God had allowed but which Muḥammad then placed under ban. Al-Ṭabarī notes, however, that some say that the “allowed thing” (*ḥalāl*) was “Māriyah his Coptic slave” (*Māriyah mamlūkatuhu al-qubṭiyah*) from whom Muḥammad forbade him-

⁸⁰ This one more accurate than the first, *placare* replacing *facere voluntatem*, for example.

⁸¹ *Liber denudationis* 7.2.

⁸² See R. M. Speight, “The Function of *ḥadīth* as Commentary on the Qur’ān,” pp. 63-81, esp. 68-72.

⁸³ *Glossarium*, p.180. Al-Ṭabarī, for example, always introduces the verse(s) to be commented on with the phrase “The statement in explanation of His statement (He is sublime and exalted!) . . .” (“*al-Qawl fī ta’wīl qawlihi ‘azza wa-jalla . . .*”). See al-Ṭabarī, *passim*.

self in order to satisfy his wife Ḥaḥṣah who was jealous of his attention toward Māriyah.⁸⁴ To illustrate this opinion, he cites several ḥadīths which all tell slightly different versions of the story found in our Latin text. The first one which he lists, for example, says that

The Apostle of God . . . was having sex with the mother of Ibrāhīm [i. e. Māriyah the Copt] in the house of one of his wives . . . , so [the wife] said, "What a prophet of God! In my house and on my bed! So [Muḥammad] declared her [i. e. Māriyah] to be a thing forbidden to himself, but [his wife] said, "how can you forbid to yourself something which is allowed?" So he swore to her by God that he would not have sex with [Māriyah] again. But God . . . revealed [this verse]: "O Prophet, why do you forbid what God has made permissible to you, [that is] trying to placate your wives?"⁸⁵

Here, therefore, is essentially the same content and structure of exposition as that found in the *Liber denudationis*: the verses are stated, the problem of Ḥaḥṣah's jealousy of Māriyah is recounted together with a ḥadīth which provides the evidence for it, and in the course of the ḥadīth the verses are restated. Hence, it is almost certain that the source for the Christian author's comments is one of the many commentaries on the Qur'ān.

Likewise when the author of *Liber denudationis* describes Muḥammad's miracle of splitting the moon, he is probably drawing his information from a Qur'ānic commentary. Again he first quotes the relevant verse of the Qur'ān: "The hour approached and the moon was divided" (*Aproinquauit hora et partita est luna* [54:1]). He indicates that he is relying on a commentary when he observes that the phrase "the moon was divided" means "cut into parts, as they explain it" (*scissa in partes, ut exponunt*), for in fact the commentators frequently explained the meaning of this verse word for word or phrase by phrase before moving on to the interpretation of its more subtle points. Al-Ṭabarī, for example, writes at the beginning of his commentary on

⁸⁴ Al-Ṭabarī on 66:1; 28, p. 155.

⁸⁵ "Inna rasūl Allāh . . . aṣāba umm Ibrāhīm fī bayt ba'ḍ nisā'ihi . . . fa-qālat, ayy rasūl Allāh fī baytī wa-'alā firāshī! fa-ja'alaha 'alay-hi ḥarāman fa-qālat, yā rasūl Allāh kayfa tuḥarrimu 'alay-ka al-ḥalāl? fa-ḥalafa la-hā bi-Allāh uṭ yuṣībuhā fa-anzala Allāh . . . ayyuhā al-nabī lima tuḥarrimu mā aḥalla Allāh la-ka tabtaghī marḍāt azwājika" (al-Ṭabarī on 66:1; 28, p. 155).

this verse that the phrase “the moon was split” (*inshaqqa al-qamar*) means “the moon was divided” (*infalaqa al-qamar*).⁸⁶ The Mozrabic author then observes that “They all [the Muslim commentators] have agreed in this narrative of explanation” (*Omnes conuenerunt in hac expositionis narratione*), that the Prophet was seated with his disciples who asked for a miracle so he caused the moon to split, the two parts of it falling on two mountains near Mecca.⁸⁷ According to al-Ṭabarī, all the expositors (*ahl al-ta’wīl*) do agree on essentially this same account of the occasion for the revelation of these verses. “The unbelieving Meccans,” he writes, “asked [Muḥammad] for a miracle so he showed them the splitting of the moon.” He further observes that some men say that one piece of the moon remained while the other disappeared, while others say that they fell on either side of one of the mountains near Mecca.⁸⁸ Once again the language and structure of this passage clearly point to a Qur’ānic commentary as the source.

It must be stressed that in his comments on both Māriyah the Copt and the miraculous splitting of the moon, the author of *Liber denudationis* made use of some extra-Qur’ānic information that could have been taken from sources other than Qur’ānic commentaries. Ibn Sa’d (d. 845), for example, dedicates a whole chapter to Māriyah the Copt in his *al-Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā*, a lengthy biographical work designed as an aid in the study of Ḥadīth. Here he lists many ḥadīths bearing on her life, and among them is one related on the authority of ‘Ā’ishah (another of Muḥammad’s wives) who insisted that she was not jealous of anyone except Māriyah and this was because she was beautiful, and “the Apostle of God admired her” (*u’jiba bi-hā rasūl Allāh*) so much that he was with her day and night. Other ḥadīths quoted by Ibn Sa’d indicate that Ḥafṣah was the offended wife, and then explain that Muḥammad’s placing her under ban led God to reveal verses 66:2-3.⁸⁹ Moreover, Ibn Sa’d makes clear in the beginning of his

⁸⁶ al-Ṭabarī on 54:1; 27, p. 84.

⁸⁷ *Liber denudationis* 9.11.

⁸⁸ “Inna kuffār ahl Makkah sa’alūhu āyatan fa-arāhum . . . inshiqāq al-qamar” (al-Ṭabarī on 54:1; 27, p. 84, cf. 84-87, and also al-Zamakhsharī on 54:1; 4, pp. 430-431).

⁸⁹ Muḥammad ibn Sa’d, *al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā* 8, pp. 212-13.

account of Māriyah's life that "al-Muqawqis the lord of Alexandria sent . . . Māriyah and her sister to the Apostle of God,"⁹⁰ a fact that our Mozarabic author knows but which al-Ṭabarī does not mention.

Likewise Muslim ibn Ḥajjāj includes in his Ḥadīth collection several ḥadīths which describe how Muḥammad caused the moon to split. One informs us that "when we (his Companions) were with the Apostle of God . . . at Miná, lo and behold the moon split in two pieces so that a piece was behind the mountain and a piece was before it."⁹¹ Another describes how the people of Mecca asked the Prophet for a miracle, so he showed them the moon as it split.⁹² Moreover the same sorts of ḥadīths can be found in an Andalusī Muslim work more-or-less contemporary with *Liber denudationis*, Qāḍī 'Iyāḍ's *al-Shifā' bi-ta'rīf ḥuqūq al-muṣṭafā*. This book describing the virtues of the Prophet was so popular that over twenty commentaries were written on it between the 14th and the 19th centuries.⁹³ In a chapter on Muḥammad's miracles, Qāḍī 'Iyāḍ lists ḥadīths very like those quoted by al-Ṭabarī and Muslim ibn Ḥajjāj.⁹⁴ Most surprisingly, however, some of the detail included by the Mozarabic author of *Liber denudationis*, but missing from al-Zamakhsharī, Muslim ibn Ḥajjāj, and Qāḍī 'Iyāḍ, can be found in one of the commentaries on the *Shifā'*: Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn 'Umar al-Khafājī (c. 1571-1659)⁹⁵ observed that when Muḥammad directed the attention of those with him to the moon, he did so by pointing "with his middle and index finger."⁹⁶ This is just what our Christian

⁹⁰ "Ba'atha al-Muqawqis šāhib al-Iskandarīyah ilá rasūl Allāh . . . bi-Māriyah wa-bi-ukthūhā" (Muḥammad ibn Sa'd, *al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā* 8, p. 212).

⁹¹ "Baynamā naḥnu ma'a rasūl Allāh . . . bi-Miná idhā infalaqa al-qamar filqatayn fa-kānat filqah warā'a al-jabal wa-filqah dūna-hu" (Muslim 50 [ṣifāt al-qiyyāmah wa-al-jannah wa-al-nār]; 17, p. 144).

⁹² Muslim 50 (ṣifāt al-qiyyāmah wa-al-jannah wa-al-nār); 17, p. 145; cf. al-Bukhārī 65, sūrah 54, bab 1.

⁹³ W. Watt, *A History of Islamic Spain*, p. 134.

⁹⁴ 'Iyāḍ ibn Mūsá (Qāḍī 'Iyāḍ), *al-Shifā'* 1. 4. 10; 1, pp. 396-400.

⁹⁵ On this commentator see "al-Khafājī," EI² 4:912-13.

⁹⁶ "Bi-iṣba'ihi al-wuṣṭá wa-al-sabbābah" Shihāb al-Dīn (Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn 'Umar) al-Khafājī, *Nasīm al-riyāḍ fī sharḥ shifā' al-Qāḍī 'Iyāḍ* 3, p. 2).

author says: *innuit lunae digitis, indice et medio*.⁹⁷

But while the author of *Liber denudationis* may well have gathered some of the details which he uses in fleshing out these events from works other than Qur'ānic commentaries, his use of such phrases as "this narrative of explanation" that automatically suggest commentaries, together with the commentary-like structure of these passages, indicate that the core of his exposition of these verses was some Qur'ānic commentary.

When he describes at great length the miraculous night journey of Muḥammad into heaven, his sources must similarly have included a Qur'ānic commentary. Muḥammad, he observes,

said in the Chapter of the Children of Israel, *Praise be to Him Who made His servant travel one night from the oratory of Elharam*—. . . which is the house of Mecca where the body of Muhammad is—to the most remote oratory—which is the Holy House in Jerusalem—around which we have given thanks (17:1).⁹⁸

Notice how similar this annotated quotation of the verse is, for example, to part of the initial commentary on this verse by the later medieval commentator Ibn Kathīr (d. 1373):

. . . *Who made His servant travel*—He means Muḥammad—one night—that is in the darkness of night—from the Sacred Mosque—and that is the mosque of Mecca—to the most distant mosque—and that is the Holy House [i. e. Jerusalem] . . .⁹⁹

Liber denudationis' author then says that "The explanation (*expositio*) of these verses is" (12.2) the very lengthy and detailed account of the famous *mī'rāj* which he then supplies (12.2-8), and this account is clearly the direct translation of one of the countless, slightly different versions of these events which were spread abroad in the Islamic world in Qur'ānic commentaries, Ḥadīth collections, and other Islamic books.¹⁰⁰ He could, of course, have found his specific version of the Night Journey in any one of countless books other than Qur'ānic commentaries, but the struc-

⁹⁷ *Liber denudationis* 9.11.

⁹⁸ *Liber denudationis*, 12.1. For the meaning of *Elharam* see my commentary to 12.1.

⁹⁹ "Alladhī asrā bi-ʿabdihi yaʿnī Muḥammadan . . . laylan ay fī junḥ al-layl min al-masjid al-ḥarām wa-huwa masjid Makkah ilā al-masjid al-aqṣā wa-huwa bayt al-maqdis . . ." (Ibn Kathīr on 17:1; 3, p. 5).

¹⁰⁰ See my commentary to *Liber denudationis* 12.1-8.

ture and language of his presentation of this miracle both suggest that at least part of his information about these events came from such a commentary.

While he composed his refutation of Islam, therefore, the desk of the anonymous author of *Liber denudationis* must have been cluttered with volumes of Ḥadīth collections, Qur'ānic commentaries, and Islamic histories, as well as earlier Oriental-Christian polemical works such as the *Apology of al-Kindī*. Indeed, the evidence suggests that he learned in a variety of ways the many ḥadīths which he quotes or paraphrases: some he may have heard orally; some he may have borrowed from older Arab-Christian works; others he took from Ḥadīth collections and other Islamic books; still others he almost certainly found in Qur'ānic commentaries; and in some instances, such as his account of Muḥammad's night journey, he may well have combined Traditional material drawn from more than one of these sources.

*

Unfortunately, the author of *Liber denudationis* and the other Mozarabic apologists almost never say specifically what Ḥadīth collections, or commentaries, or other books were the sources of their knowledge of "that which [Muḥammad's] companions and followers . . . have handed down from him."¹⁰¹ We cannot, therefore, say with certainty which Islamic works any specific writer knew.¹⁰² What is clear is that while these Mozarabs were compos-

¹⁰¹ *Liber denudationis* 1.2. In this they are unlike Ramon Martí who, in his *Quadruplex reprobatio* written in the thirteenth century, carefully indicates throughout his work which of his three main sources he is quoting, referring to them as *Liber Bohari* (=al-Bukhārī), *Liber Muslim* (=Muslim), and *Liber Ciar* (=the *Strat rasūl Allāh* [i. e., biography of the Prophet] of Ibn Ishāq); see *Quadruplex reprobatio*, passim. It is likely also, I might add, that Martí used Qur'ānic commentaries in this work as well, for at one point he writes "Item tangitur in Alchorano in Tractatu Prohibicionis (i. e. Sūrat al-Taḥrīm [66]) in principio et in glosa que est ibi quod . . . (my italics)" (*Quadruplex reprobatio*, fol. 153rb, ll. 27-29). Martí's use of both the Ḥadīth and Qur'ānic commentaries will be discussed at greater length in chapter six.

¹⁰² The author of *Taḥlīth al-waḥdānīyah* does mention Muslim, as I noted above, but, so far as I can tell does not quote any ḥadīth from his collection.

ing their treatises, they were reading a variety of books in which Islamic Traditions played an important role and were putting the individual ḥadīths which they found there to polemical and apologetic use, thereby supplementing considerably what they had learned about Islam and how to confront it from Oriental Arab-Christian apologists.

Furthermore, while it is impossible to specify exactly which sources our authors were using, it is possible to draw two fairly important conclusions about the manner and significance of their use of these sources. First of all, it is clear, especially in *Tathlīth al-waḥdāntyah* and *Liber denudationis*, that Mozarabic apologists understood the role of the chains of authorities attached to ḥadīths, whether they are found in Ḥadīth collections, Qur'anic commentaries, or other Traditional texts. Those two authors provide complete *isnāds* for some of the ḥadīths which they quote and partial *isnāds* for others, such as when the former author points out that the account of Muḥammad's prophecy of the end of the world was given "on the authority of a certain Abimassar."¹⁰³ Furthermore, the author of *Liber denudationis* repeatedly makes clear that he is using what he believes are ḥadīths which all Muslims concede are valid. The traditions which he cites are frequently referred to by such phrases as "verified accounts" or "this narrative or history is known among them, and neither the learned man nor the ignorant reject it".¹⁰⁴ All this suggests that Mozarabs understood that the true test of a ḥadīth's veracity was not merely its content but its *isnād* as well.

This first conclusion leads to a second. If these Christian authors went to all the trouble of quoting ḥadīths with complete or partial *isnāds* because the chain of authorities is the element which guarantees the ḥadīth's validity, then we can only conclude that, in part at least, these works were intended to be convincing to Muslims themselves. That this is so is, of course, indicated by the fact that both *Tathlīth al-waḥdāntyah* and the *Liber denudationis* were

¹⁰³ *Liber denudationis* 9.23.

¹⁰⁴ "historiae aprobatae" (*Liber denudationis* 9.23); "Haec . . . narratio siue historia nota est apud eos quam non respuit neque sapiens neque stultus" (*Liber denudationis* 2.2).

originally written in Arabic, the language of Andalusī Muslims; but this particular manner of using the Islamic traditions is particularly strong evidence that these works—unlike the countless Latin tracts written in Europe against Islam—were directed at Muslim audiences in addition to Arabic-speaking Christians. And of course *Tathlith al-wahdānīyah* and *The Letter of al-Qūṭī* were both rebutted in lengthy Arabic treatises written by Andalusī Muslims, so that we can hardly doubt that they were considered something of a threat. All this suggests, therefore, that, like the Oriental-Christian polemical and apologetic tradition in Arabic, the Mozarabic anti-Islamic tradition of Spain was part of a true literary discussion between members of the two religious communities.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰⁵ One famous Arab-Christian apologetic written in Arabic in the Middle East, Būlus al-Anṭākī's *Letter to a Muslim Friend from Sidon*, was rebutted by at least two Muslim scholars including the great *faqīh* Ibn Taymīyah; see *Bibliographie* 12. 25. 3, *Islamochristiana* 2 (1976):234, and P. Khoury, *Paul d'Antioche*, pp. 10, note 12, 14.

CHAPTER FIVE
ABELARD'S TRIAD AND CHRISTIAN *KALĀM*
IN SPAIN: LATIN THEOLOGY IN
MOZARABIC APOLOGETIC

The Mozarabs of Spain worshipped according to the Latin Visigothic rite and maintained connections with the Latin-Christian world beyond the Pyrenees.¹ Some of their ancestors in the early centuries of Islamic rule, Eulogius and Paulus Alvarus most notable among them, had cultivated written Latin in a zealous if slightly provincial fashion in an attempt to maintain their cultural integrity.² Although after the ninth century very little was written in Latin by Spanish Christians living under Islamic rule, they continued to be deeply interested in their Latin heritage. Of this there is no more eloquent evidence than their Arabic translations of the Latin Bible and Latin works on canon law and history.³ In the period from 1050 to 1200, this continued interest in Latin culture on the part of Mozarabs particularly manifested itself in the abundant twelfth-century Arabic annotations of Latin manuscripts containing works by Isidore, Gregory the Great, Augustine, and Eusebius, and Christian legal texts.⁴

¹ On these connections in general see M. Díaz y Díaz, "La circulation des manuscrits dans la Péninsule Ibérique," pp. 220-31. A particularly relevant example of this continued interaction is Hugh of St. Victor's correspondence with a Mozarab bishop in the early twelfth century which I will discuss later in the chapter; see also F. Simonet, *Historia de los mozárabes*, p. 756-57; and J. de Ghellinck, *Le mouvement théologique du XIIe siècle*, p. 189.

² For bibliography on Eulogius and Paulus Alvarus see chapters one and two above, pp. 18, 33-34.

³ On these translations see H. Goussen, *Die christlich-arabische Literatur der Mozaraber*, passim; P. van Koningsveld, "La literatura cristiano-árabe," passim; and Id., *The Latin-Arabic Glossary*, pp. 52-60; the latter two works have a large amount of useful bibliography. Andalusī Christians continued to *copy* and *study* older Latin works as well; see for example, M. Díaz y Díaz, "Agusún entre los mozárabes," passim, esp. pp. 167-68, 177-80.

⁴ See P. van Koningsveld, *The Latin-Arabic Glossary*, pp. 45-52 for a thorough discussion of these mss. together with abundant bibliographical references. The possession of books written in Latin letters by a Mozarab

This continued, though limited, cultivation of Latin culture among Mozarabs throughout these centuries made it almost inevitable that Latin-Christian thought should come to exert some degree of influence over the way in which they grappled intellectually with Islam, even though their approach to Islam was in large part learned from Oriental Christian writers. In fact, the scattered evidence which we have suggests that the earliest Arabicized Christians in Spain had already begun to incorporate Latin thought into their Arabic writings. A short fragment of Ḥaṣṣ ibn Albar's *Book of Fifty-Seven Questions*⁵ demonstrates this vividly. Here Ḥaṣṣ describes the interrelationships of the three persons of the Trinity:

These three hypostases are united on account of the Father and equal on account of the Son and interconnected on account of the Spirit. So we believe that the Father is the Father because He possesses a Son and that the Son is the Son because He possesses a Father and that the Holy Spirit is a procession because He is from the Father and the Son The Holy Spirit [proceeding] from Him is not born because He is not a son, and is not other than born because He was not created . . . rather [the Spirit] is God proceeding from the Father and the Son.⁶

Now on the one hand we have here the same kind of Oriental-Christian linguistic influence discussed in the previous chapter: the

deported to North Africa in the twelfth century (as recounted in a *fatwā* of Wansharīshī) is further evidence of this interest in the Latin heritage; see V. Lagardère, "Communautés mozarabes et pouvoir almoravide," pp. 113-14.

⁵ On this work see the beginning of chapter two above.

⁶ "Hādhihi al-thalāthah al-aqānīm mutawahhīdah li-ajl al-ab mutasāwīyah li-ajl al-ibn muntaẓimah li-ajl al-rūḥ. Fa-nu'minu [bi-]anna al-ab ab li-ajl annahu dhū ibn wa-al-ibn ibn li-annahu dhū ab wa-al-rūḥ al-quḍs munbathiq li-annahu min al-ab wa-al-ibn al-rūḥ al-quḍs min-hu laysa mawlūdan li-annahu laysa ibnan wa-lā ghair mawlūd li-annahu laysa makhḷūqan . . . bal ilāh munbathiq min al-ab wa-al-ibn" ([attributed to] Ḥaṣṣ ibn Albar in al-Qurṭubī, p. 80). The only word which presents difficulty in translation here is *muntaẓimah*; Devillard proposed *hiérarchisées* in his French version (see P. Devillard, "Thèse sur al-Qurṭubī [translation]," p. 57) which seems unlikely to me given the potentially heretical possibilities of suggesting a hierarchy within the Trinity; my choice of *interconnected* is allowable lexically, since the root NẒM means both "to order or classify" and "to put together or group"—"to interconnect" has some of the sense of both meanings—and is appropriate for reasons which will become clear just below.

word which Ḥaḥṣ uses for "hypostases" is *aqāntm* of Greek-Syriac origin. On the other hand, this passage presents two fairly clear examples of Latin-Christian influence. First, we have references in the second and third sentences to the Latin *filioque* doctrine when Ḥaḥṣ writes that the Holy Spirit is "a procession because he is from the Father and the Son," and that the Spirit "is God proceeding from the Father and the Son."⁷ Second, and more importantly, the first sentence in this passage is a close translation of a sentence of Augustine which was often quoted in the Middle Ages, especially in descriptions of the interrelationship of the members of the Trinity: . . . *et tria haec unum omnia propter patrem, aequalia omnia propter filium, conexa omnia propter spiritum sanctum*.⁸ If al-Qurṭubī is correct in attributing this fragment to Ḥaḥṣ ibn Albar, then already in the late ninth century an Arabicized Christian in Spain can be found incorporating Latin-Christian doctrine and thought into theology written in Arabic.⁹

This practice, apparently current in the time of Ḥaḥṣ ibn Albar more than two hundred years previously, continues in the eleventh- and twelfth-century works of interest to this study—though not, it must be emphasized, at a very high level. While we encounter Oriental-Christian influences on these works at nearly every turn,¹⁰ and while we find the Mozarabic authors frequently quoting from the literature of Islamic Tradition,¹¹ the signs of

⁷ It is worth noting that the word used here for "procession" and "proceeding", *munbathiq*, is a participle of the verb *inbathaqa*, which is explicitly identified by the contemporary *Glossarium Latino-Arabicum* as the Arabic counterpart of the Latin *procedo* used in the Nicene Creed to describe the Spirit's relationship to the Father and the Son; see *Glossarium*, p. 405.

⁸ Augustine, *De doctrina christiana* 1. 5. 5, CCSL 32:9, ll. 16-18. On this passage in general see J. Châtillon, "Unitas, aequalitas, concordia vel connexio," *passim*.

⁹ There are reasons to think that the fragment is from a much later date, among them that, as Châtillon points out, the use of this sentence of Augustine was particularly popular in Trinitarian thought in the twelfth century; see J. Châtillon, "Unitas, aequalitas, concordia vel connexio," p. 359. P. van Koningsveld has more to say on the apologetic nature of these fragments attributed to Ḥaḥṣ ibn Albar in his "La literatura cristiano-árabe," pp. 699-700.

¹⁰ See ch. 3 above.

¹¹ See ch. 4 above.

Latin-Christian influence are few and often elusive; and they are confined to only some of the sources. *Liber denudationis*, for example, although it is the longest source by far, contains no clear evidence that its author made any attempt to include distinctively Latin-Christian ideas in his refutation of Islam; this makes sense because, as I noted in chapter two, it is likely that its anonymous author did not know Latin competently in any case. We do, however, find evidence of substantial reliance on Latin theology in the Trinitarian arguments of two of our sources; these arguments, though they are intentionally couched in the technical language of the doctors of *Kalām*, nevertheless also make use of certain widespread (and controversial) ideas about the Trinity originally developed by Peter Abelard.

*

Just as certain lexical usages are the first signs of the Mozarabic familiarity with Oriental Arab-Christian apologetic and theology, so also the first evidence of their reliance on Latin-Christian thought is linguistic. These writers, for example, occasionally employ certain neologisms which appear to be Arabic calques based on Latin models. Professor Samir has noted that the word which the priest al-Qūṭī uses for “to be incarnate”—*iltaḥama* meaning literally “to become flesh”—is found nowhere else in Arab-Christian literature. Rather, Oriental Christians use either *tajassada*, “to become a body”,¹² or *ta’annasa*, “to become a human being”. Al-Qūṭī’s word, *iltaḥama*, moreover, is an exact translation of the Latin *incarno* (and, for that matter, the periphrastic *caro factum est* as used in John 1:14 in the Vulgate), while the two Oriental-Christian words are translations from the Greek. In Samir’s view, therefore, *iltaḥama* is a new Arabic word, formed in accordance with the rules of Arabic morphology but on the model of a Latin word. Similarly Samir argues that when al-Qūṭī uses the neologism *ṣulūbiyah*, rather than the normal

¹² *tajassada*, for example, appears in the Oriental-Christian Creed which Ibn Ḥazm quotes (*al-Faṣl* 1:118); see chapter two above, pp. 89-90.

Arab-Christian *ṣalb*, to mean crucifixion (in which usage he is followed by al-Khazrajī in his rebuttal), he is also doing so in order to translate the Latin literally, for *ṣulūbīyah* corresponds morphologically to *crucifixio*.¹³

The verb *iltahama* meaning "to become flesh" appears to have been quite common indeed among Spain's Arab Christians, and this appears to be attributable to Ishāq ibn Balāshk's use of it in his Arabic translation of the Old Latin Gospels. Ibn Ḥazm, who used that translation in *al-Faṣl*,¹⁴ wrote, in the course of disputing the Christian doctrine of the Trinity, that John taught in the beginning of his Gospel that "the Word *iltahamat* in the placenta of Mary", and that "God himself *iltahama*."¹⁵ He then goes on to explain the meaning of this term in a way that illuminates its dependence on the Latin word *incarno* and its difference from the usages of the Oriental Church: "Let it be said to them . . . Is the meaning of *iltahama* anything else than 'to become flesh'? This is not the teaching of the Nestorians or the Melkites."¹⁶

The author of *Tathlith al-wahdānīyah* also uses *iltahama* when referring to the Incarnation. When he quotes John 1:14 he seems to be using Ibn Balāshk's translation; for once again we have *iltahamat al-kalimah*, "the Word became flesh."¹⁷ He also uses the verbal noun (*maṣḍar*) of the same form of the Arabic root when he writes that "the Word was designated uniquely to become flesh": *fa-ufrida al-kalimah bi-al-iltihām*.¹⁸ These Mozarabic

¹³ Kh. Samir, "Review," p. 253; cf. al-Qūṭī in al-Khazrajī 3, p. 32 for *iltahama* and al-Khazrajī 4 (al-Qūṭī), 51, 56 and 58, pp. 33, 77, 78, 81 and 83 for *ṣulūbīyah* and note Samir's correction of Charfī's text indicated, *ibid.*, p. 253, note 78. As Samir indicates, *ibid.*, G. Graf does not include either of these terms in his *Verzeichnis arabischer kirchlicher Termini*. Al-Qurṭubī, who had read al-Khazrajī's rebuttal of the priest's letter (see van Koningsveld, "La apología de al-Kindī," p. 125), also uses the term *ṣulūbīyah*; see al-Qurṭubī. p. 245.

¹⁴ See P. van Koningsveld, *The Latin-Arabic Glossary*, p. 55.

¹⁵ "al-Kalimah *iltahamat* fī mashīmat Maryam, fa-Allāh ta'ālā huwa nafsuhu *iltahama*" (Ibn Ḥazm, *al-Faṣl* 1:119).

¹⁶ "Wa-yuqālu la-hum . . . hal ma'na *iltahama* illā šāra laḥman wa-hādḥā ghayr qawl al-Nuṣṭūrīyah wa-al-Malkīyah" (Ibn Ḥazm, *al-Faṣl* 1:119).

¹⁷ *Tathlith al-wahdānīyah* in al-Qurṭubī, p. 91.

¹⁸ *Tathlith al-wahdānīyah* in al-Qurṭubī, p. 91.

authors, therefore, while they relied on Oriental-Christian vocabulary, also were developing a Christian Arabic vocabulary of their own, based on models provided by their Latin heritage.

*

These scattered examples of the linguistic influence of Latin over the Arabic of these texts¹⁹ are the harbingers of a more substantial and interesting sort of Latin influence, the adoption and adaption by some of these Mozarabic authors of contemporary Latin theological ideas. Now demonstrating this sort of influence is fraught with difficulty, for distinguishing between ideas that are distinctly Latin-Christian and those common to all Christians is not a simple matter. Nevertheless, we do find occasional comments which indicate specifically Latin sources, such as when Ibn Ḥazm reports that a Mozarab explained the difference between the genealogies of Jesus in Matthew and Luke according to the so-called "adoption" theory which was formulated by Augustine.²⁰

The most important example of the use of distinctively Latin ideas by Mozarabs, however, is their surprising adoption and

¹⁹ Professor Samir suggested that such influence of Latin could also be found in the translation of the *Pater noster* included in al-Qūṭī's apology. It begins *abānā alladhi anta fi al-samā'* . . . (Mt 6:9), literally, "Our Father who you are in Heaven. . . (al-Qūṭī in al-Khazrajī 5, p. 34)" The *anta*, while not altogether superfluous, is not really necessary either since it merely restates the subject of the sentence which had been made clear by the previous words, "Our father who . . ." Samir argues, therefore, that this *anta* has been situated in the Arabic syntax to correspond to the Latin construction in which the second person of *sum* is prominently (and necessarily) placed after the conjunction *qui*: *Pater noster qui es in caelis* . . . (Kh. Samir, "Review," p. 246, n. 25) This intriguing argument is strengthened considerably when it is noticed that this *anta* is not found in other medieval Arabic versions of the *Pater noster* which I have examined. Cf. Mt 6:9 in *Die griechisch-arabische Evangelien-übersetzung*, p. 8 (Arabic); cf. G. Graf, *Geschichte der christlichen arabischen Literatur* 1, pp. 142-43; Tatian, *al-Diyāṭasarūn. Diatessaron de Tatien* 9. 32, p. 86; and Mt 6:9 as quoted in the Arabic commentary on the St. Matthew in *La cadena árabe del evangelio de San Mateo* 1, p. 58.

²⁰ See Ibn Ḥazm, *al-Faṣl* 2:32-33; cf. M. Asín-Palacios, *Abenházam de Córdoba* 3:28-29, esp. note 39 and Augustine, *De consensu evangelistarum* 2. 1-3, CSEL 43, pp. 82-88.

adaptation of some of the most widespread and controversial ideas of twelfth-century Latin-Christian theology. As I shall argue now at some length, two of our sources attempt to persuade Muslim (and perhaps Jewish) intellectuals of the validity of the Trinity by defending it in the terminology of the *Kalām*. To do so, however, they combine an apologetic approach to the Trinity devised previously in the Middle East with certain controversial Trinitarian ideas originating among Peter Abelard and his followers. The result is an intriguing hybrid of ideas drawn from two different Christian traditions and is evidence of remarkable intellectual vitality on the part of at least a few Mozarabic intellectuals.

The best example of this hybrid Trinitarian apologetic occurs in the first of the three sections of *Taḥlīṭh al-waḥdānīyah* or *Trinitizing the Unity of God*. Here the anonymous *converso* author attempts to demonstrate that the one God is a Trinity, and the argument runs as follows: In the short introductory paragraph prefixed to the work as a whole, the author stipulates that he will speak about God “not as if we understand His essence, nor as if we perceive anything regarding it. Rather, we have merely become acquainted with the names of His actions in His creating and His governance in His lordship.”²¹ These words establish the theoretical foundation for the author’s demonstration of the Trinity, for it is based solely on what we can know about God from His external actions with respect to creation.²² To begin the

²¹ “. . . ghayr wāqifīna ‘alā dhātīhi wa-lā mudrikīna li-shay’ min-hu. wa-innamā naqa’u ‘alā asmā’ af’ālihi fī khalīqatīhi wa-tadbīrihi fī rubūbīyatihi” (*Taḥlīṭh al-waḥdānīyah* in al-Qurṭubī, p. 47). I have translated *waqa’a* ‘alā, which literally means “to fall on,” or “to alight upon,” or “to run across,” (cf. Devillard’s “nous arrêtons” in P. Devillard, “Thèse sur al-Qurṭubī [translation],” p. 10), as “to become acquainted with” because this gets across the sense of the verb in the context. It might be noted that al-Qurṭubī also understood the verb in this way. In commenting on this passage he derides the Christian author’s use of Arabic (a common theme throughout his rebuttal) saying, among other things, that the Christian author of *Taḥlīṭh al-waḥdānīyah* “means *na’rifu* [= “we have become acquainted”] by his saying *naqa’u* [= “we have fallen, etc.”], otherwise his mode of expression is not proper” (“arāda bi-qawlihi ‘naqa’u’ ‘na’rifu’ wa-illā lam yastaqim kalāmuhu”); al-Qurṭubī, p. 52.

²² As I pointed out in chapter two, the rationalism of this argument, particularly its attempt to demonstrate the Trinity only on the basis of what we know of God from His actions in creation, is strikingly similar to the rationalism of Ibn

argument proper he asks, "Did God's creation of [all that He created] occur by means of power and knowledge and will, or did He create them without these?"²³ Assuming that any Muslim would agree that God created through these faculties, the author then asks if these three faculties are names for His essence (*asmā' li-dhātihi*) or names for His acts (*asmā' li-af'ālihi*). One cannot say that they are the former, he argues, without being guilty of anthropomorphism. They must be the latter, therefore, and as such they are the properties on account of which God is called the Powerful, the Knowing, and the Willing, and this, the author contends, is nothing other than the Trinity.²⁴

But if a Muslim should ask why Christians use the terms Father, Son, and Holy Spirit to refer to the persons of the Trinity, rather than the Powerful, the Knowing, and the Willing, the author of *Tathlith al-wahdānīyah* answers that Jesus commanded his disciples to baptize in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit (Mt 28:19). Jesus used these names according to the "distinction between the purposes of these acts" (*ikhtilāf qadāyā tilka al-af'al*) in God.²⁵ The first purpose is the creation of all things and it is naturally named the Father since it is attributed to the faculty of power. The second purpose is the exhortation of mankind and it is attributed naturally to the faculty of knowledge

Tūmart's thought; he likewise argued that the nature of God could be apprehended from all existing things (*mawjūdāt*) and all created things (*makhluqāt*); see Ibn Tūmart, *Murshidāh* 1, in J. Luciani, *Le livre de Mohammed Ibn Toumert*, p. 241.

²³ "as'aluka fī amr al-tathlith 'an khalq Allāh li-jamī' mā khalaqa: in kāna khalquhum bi-qudrah wa-'ilm wa-irādah am khalaqahum bi-ghayr hādha?" (*Tathlith al-wahdānīyah* in al-Qurṭubī, p. 57).

²⁴ *Tathlith al-wahdānīyah* in al-Qurṭubī, p. 57.

²⁵ "purposes" here translates *qadāyā* which would normally mean "legal actions," "matters," or "issues" among other things. The author, who (as I will show presently) is relying on Latin sources, may have in mind the Latin word *causi* which means both "legal actions" and "causes" or "purposes" in a generic sense. *Causi* is used by Abelard with the latter meanings in a passage very similar to this (see his *Theologia christiana* 1. 1, CCCM 12:72, l. 6). Abelard's works show other similarities with *Tathlith al-wahdānīyah* as I will show later in this chapter. P. Devillard translates *qadāyā* with "œuvres"; see his "Thèse sur al-Qurṭubī (translation)," p. 31.

and called the Son, for, to be understood, knowledge must be born as speech. The purpose of the annihilation (*fanā'*) of all things (at the end of time) and the rewarding of all people for their acts is attributed to the faculty of will and called the Holy Spirit. The names Father, Son, and Holy Spirit revealed in Scripture, therefore, are merely other names for God corresponding to the Powerful, the Knowing, and the Willing which we arrive at by reason based on God's actions.²⁶

It might be objected, the author of *Tathlūh al-wahdānīyah* admits, that we call God many other things besides the Powerful, the Knowing, and the Willing, for He is customarily known as the Mighty (*'azīz*), the Strong (*qawī*), the Victorious (*ghalīb*), the Hearing (*samī'*), the Conqueror (*qāhir*), the Seeing (*baṣīr*), the Forgiving (*ghafūr*), the Tolerant (*rāḍī*), the Angry (*sākhiṭ*), the Punishing (*mu'āqib*) and so on. But, the Mozarabic author responds, the three faculties mentioned earlier—power, knowledge, and will—are the sources (*uṣūl*) of all these other names: they emanate (*tanbathiqu*) from those three sources and are incorporated (*tandaghimu*) in them. The faculty of power, for example, is the source of names such as the Mighty, the Strong, the Victorious, and the Conquering; while the faculty of will is the source of such names as the Forgiving, the Consenting, the Angry, and the Punishing.

The author further allows that it might be objected that God is also called the Living (*ḥayy*) and the Eternal (*qadīm*), and that these two names cannot be reduced to any member of the triad Powerful, Knowing, and Willing. Why not believe in a "quintity" (*takhmīs*) therefore? In response, the author of *Tathlūh al-wahdānīyah* observes that Living and Eternal are not names for God's actions, but are rather names of His essence (*asmā' dhāt*), which are only used to describe God's essence by negation of their opposites: Living by negation of Dead; Eternal by negation of Temporal. But as for the names of His actions, these all reduce to three and no more: the Powerful, the Knowing, and the Willing.²⁷

²⁶ *Tathlūh al-wahdānīyah* in al-Qurṭubī, p. 63.

²⁷ *Tathlūh al-wahdānīyah* in al-Qurṭubī, p. 71.

Tathlīth al-wahdānīyah's author then provides an analogy for the relationship and functioning of these three faculties in the God-head. No act can come to be in the human soul without the same three faculties all working in concert, and if one of them is diminished, the act will not be complete: if one knows and wills, for example, but does not have power, the act remains incomplete. Since we know that God acted outside Himself in creation, we know, therefore, that these three faculties are necessary for God also, and must work together in Him. Hence, by the analogy of the functioning of our souls we can see that God is a Trinity.²⁸

Now Christians do not say, the Mozarabic author of this tract observes in conclusion, that three is one and one is three. Rather we say that the one substance (*jawhar*) of God exists in three persons (*khawāṣṣ*) which are undivided yet distinct. "This is our teaching on the Trinity of the Unity of the Creator."²⁹

It so happens that nearly the same argument appears in a second of our sources: the fragments of Aghushtīn's *Maṣḥaf al-ʿālam al-kā'in* that al-Qurṭubī quotes periodically in his refutation of *Tathlīth al-wahdānīyah*. After considering the above Trinitarian argument and refuting it step by step, and after then describing some other orthodox and heterodox Christian views of the Trinity as found in two other fragmentary Christian sources,³⁰ al-Qurṭubī informs his reader that, having considered these "feeble schools of thought" (*al-madhāhib al-rakīkah*) on the Trinity, he will now relate the doctrine of the great Aghushtīn.³¹

Aghushtīn first points out in this fragment that the learned Magi (*majūs*), by which he means pagan (probably Greek)

²⁸ *Tathlīth al-wahdānīyah* in al-Qurṭubī, p. 71.

²⁹ "Fa-hādihā madhhabunā fī tathlīth wahdānīyat al-khāliq" (*Tathlīth al-wahdānīyah* in al-Qurṭubī, p. 77).

³⁰ I. e., the *Kitāb al-hurūf*, a work almost certainly of Oriental-Christian origin, and the *Book of Fifty-Seven Questions* which was probably written by Ḥafṣ ibn Albar (al-Qurṭubī, pp. 79-81). On these two fragmentary sources see above, chapter 2, pp. 35-36, 93.

³¹ Aghushtīn in al-Qurṭubī, p. 81. As I argued in ch. 2, although al-Qurṭubī seems to believe that this Aghushtīn is the famous Bishop of Hippo (and the modern editor of the work agrees), this can hardly be so given the anti-Islamic content of the fragments.

philosophers,³² believed in a universal power which embraced all things (*al-qūwah al-māsikah li-kull shayʿ*).³³ Christians, therefore, need only argue that this power possesses the faculties of knowledge and will in order to make clear the triune nature of God.³⁴ In order to do this, Aghushtīn first summarizes a contrary view, attributed to Porphyry (*Burftriyush*),³⁵ that knowledge and will, like other attributes such as mercy and judgement, are identical with God's essence and are only used with respect to God in order to describe His relationship with creation.³⁶ To refute this view, Aghushtīn observes that one cannot deny that God

existed before all things . . . without beginning. Can you deny then that [God] is eternally powerful? If you affirm that He is eternally powerful, then you have affirmed that power (*qudrah*) is an eternal attribute. But if you say that it is impossible that God be so-called before there is something over which He has exercised power,³⁷

then we respond with this question: "Can [God] be able to be able, or not?"³⁸ We must admit that God is and always was "able to be able" and so it is incumbent upon you "to describe him using [the attribute of] power."³⁹

Now the same thing can be said, Aghushtīn points out, about the attributes of knowledge (*ilm*) and will (*irādah*), so that it is

³² He is here using *majūs* with its Andalusī meaning of "pagan," rather than the eastern meaning of "Zoroastrian" (see "al-Madjūs," EI² 5:1118-21 [art. A. Melvinger]). The immediate context here (see the following note) suggests that the pagans whom the author has in mind are ancient Greek philosophers.

³³ Which he will say later in the passage—rather surprisingly—the Magi call *al-hayūl*, an Arabic version of the Greek philosophical term "hyle" meaning primordial matter.

³⁴ Aghushtīn in al-Qurṭubī, p. 82.

³⁵ Though it almost certainly is not his. Rather, this "Porphyry" appears to be the literary embodiment of pure philosophy. P. Devillard suspected that this "Porphyry" might be a veiled designation for Aristotelian Muslim philosophers; see his "Thèse sur al-Qurṭubī (introduction)," p. 18.

³⁶ Aghushtīn in al-Qurṭubī, p. 82.

³⁷ "Lasta tankiru anna-hu kāna qabla al-'ashyā' . . . bi-lā ibtidā'. Fa-hal taqdiru an tajhāda anna-hu kāna abadan qādiran? Fa-idhā aqrarta anna-hu lam yazal qādiran, fa-qad aqrarta anna al-qudrah šifah azaliyah. Fa-in qulta anna-hu lā yajūzu an yusammā qabla an yakūna al-shay' al-maqqūr 'alay-hi . . ." (Aghushtīn in al-Qurṭubī, p. 82).

³⁸ "Qulnā a-fa-kāna yaqdiru 'alā an yaqdira am lā?" (Aghushtīn in al-Qurṭubī, p. 82).

³⁹ "Fa-yalzamuka wašfuhu bi-al-qudrah" (Aghushtīn in al-Qurṭubī, p. 82).

clear that God is rightly characterized as possessing the attributes of omnipotence, knowledge, and will. These three particular attributes, however, are not like other attributes such as compassion (*rahmah*), forgiveness (*ghufrān*), and judgment (*ḥukm*), because no one says that God is eternally compassionate, since there was a time before there were any creatures for Him to be compassionate toward. These other attributes, therefore, only describe God's actions with respect to temporal creation and are not eternal themselves. The previous three attributes, however—power, knowledge, and will—, are eternal.⁴⁰ "So the three of them," he concludes,

are a name for one God and they describe one ruler; and they are not found separate from Him nor He separate from them. This is our teaching about the Trinity which the Gospel describes and requires to be believed and names . . . the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.⁴¹

Now in many ways these two very similar arguments found in *Tathlith al-waḥdānīyah* and the fragments of Aghushūn's *Maṣṣhaf al-ʿālam al-kā'in* are well within the Oriental Arab-Christian polemical tradition, and this is apparent even in some of the theological vocabulary used. For example, the summary of the doctrine of the Trinity with which the author of *Tathlith al-waḥdānīyah* concludes his argument contains the characteristically Oriental-Christian use of the terms *jawhar* and *khawāṣṣ* discussed in the last chapter.

But far more importantly, the basic approach of these two arguments has clear connections with Trinitarian arguments used in the East at an earlier date. Christian apologists living within the Islamic world commonly defended the doctrine of the Trinity using terminology and methods drawn from the *Kalām*, the Arabic religious-apologetic tradition which flourished among Muslims, but also among Arabic-speaking Christians and Jews.⁴² One of the

⁴⁰ Aghushūn in al-Qurṭubī, p. 83.

⁴¹ "Fa-thalāthatuhā ism li-ilāh wāhid . . . wa-lā tūjadu hiya ghayra-hu wa-lā yūjadu huwa ghayra-hā. Fa-hādhā qawlunā fī al-tathlith alladhī waṣafahu al-injīl wa-amara bi-al-īmān bi-hi wa-sammā-hu . . . al-ab wa-al-ibn wa-al-rūḥ al-quds" (Aghushūn in al-Qurṭubī, p. 83).

⁴² For an overview of Muslim *Kalām*, together with extensive bibliography, see R. Caspar, *Traité de théologie musulmane* 1, passim. On Christian *Kalām* see esp. the articles of S. Griffith ("Ḥabīb ibn Ḥidmah Abū Rā'īṭah;" "Ammār al-Baṣrī's *Kitāb al-burhān*;" and "The First *Summa Theologiae* in Arabic"). On

questions that most exercised the doctors of the *Kalām*, or *mutakallimūn*, of all religious persuasions was the problem of God's names and attributes.⁴³ This problem arose quite naturally because the holy books of each religion referred to God by means of a variety of names, many—if not most—of which presented ticklish theological problems. How, for example, can God be said to be "One who hears" (*samīʿ*), as the Qur'ān (2:256) puts it? Does this mean that He hears with physical ears as men hear? Or is this expression to be taken in a completely metaphorical sense? Or, again, how can God have walked in the Garden of Eden as the Jewish and Christian scriptures relate (Gen 3:8)? Does God have legs? There were a variety of answers proposed to this sort of question in all three religious traditions, and there is no point in describing these in detail here. Suffice it to say that over the course of time the discussion of God's names in the Islamic world became focused on what were known in Arabic as *ṣifāt*, or attributes. These were usually conceived of as the qualities on account of which God is described by such names as the One Who Sees, the Powerful, the Knowing, and so forth, and thus the *ṣifāt* were substantive forms grammatically: *baṣār* (vision), *qudrah* (power), *ʿilm* (knowledge).⁴⁴ Of these attributes corresponding to the names of God, only a small number were considered to be of such a fundamental nature as to warrant extensive attention, and nearly all discussions of the problem, whether by Muslim or non-Muslim, focused on these. A typical list of these most fundamental attributes would include the following: life, knowledge, power, will, sight, hearing, eternity, and word.⁴⁵

the Jewish *mutakallimūn* see C. Sirat, *A History of Jewish Philosophy*, pp. 15-56, and cf. G. Vajda, "Le kalām dans la pensée religieuse juive," *passim*.

⁴³ al-Shahrastānī (d. 1153) listed the problem of the divine attributes as one of the four fundamental problems of Islamic religion (see A. Knysh, "'Orthodoxy' and 'Heresy' in Medieval Islam," p. 51). R. Caspar, in fact, has argued that this problem was the "central problem" of Islamic theology (see his *Traité de théologie musulmane*, p. 130).

⁴⁴ On the relationship between the names (*asmāʾ*) of God and the *ṣifāt* see D. Gimaret, *La doctrine d'al-Ashʿarī*, pp. 234-45.

⁴⁵ See D. Gimaret, *La doctrine d'al-Ashʿarī*, pp. 259-67. For a brief account of the various views of the Muslim *mutakallimūn* on this question, see R. Caspar, *Traité de théologie musulmane* 1, pp. 152-53 (Muʿtazilite), 178-79 (Ashʿarite), 204 (Ḥanafite-Māturīdite), 209 (Ḥanbalite). On Jewish philosophers see I. Husik,

Christian *mutakallimūn* in the Middle East soon realized that they could turn this debate on the names and attributes of God to their own apologetic purposes, for here was fertile ground in which to cultivate arguments for the Trinity. Typically, as Rachid Haddad has shown, such apologists attempted to show that these fundamental attributes could all be reduced to just three eternal attributes, and that these three eternal attributes somehow could be identified with the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.⁴⁶ This sort of rationalist defense of the Trinity, rooted in the kalāmīc debate on God's attributes, was widespread in the Middle East during the early Middle Ages. The *Apology of al-Kindī*, written in Baghdad more than 150 years before any of our sources, provides a good example in its long defense of the Trinity, as does the fragment of the so-called *Kitāb al-ḥurūf* quoted by al-Qurṭubī in his refutation of *Tathlūth al-waḥdānīyah*.⁴⁷

The two Trinitarian arguments which I have outlined here clearly follow this general approach thoroughly. In both cases, the Christian authors have located their defense of the Trinity within this same Arabic discussion of the names and attributes of God.⁴⁸ The names of God mentioned in *Tathlūth al-waḥdānīyah* (the Powerful, the Knowing, the Willing, the Mighty, the Conqueror, the Hearing, the Seeing, etc.) are almost all drawn from the numerous Islamic lists of the names of God, or from the Qur'ān itself.⁴⁹ Moreover, many of them—e. g. 'ālim (the Knowing),

A History of Mediaeval Jewish Philosophy, pp. 18-19, 33-34, 50-52, 93-96, 145-46, 161-62, 220-21. On Arab-Christian views see R. Haddad, *La Trinité divine*, pp. 188-208.

⁴⁶ R. Haddad, *La Trinité divine*, p. 208.

⁴⁷ Much of the *Apology's* argument was borrowed directly from the Syrian Christian apologist Ḥabīb Ibn Khidmah. See *Risālat al-Kindī*, pp. 54-57; cf. Ḥabīb ibn Khidmah Abū Rā'īṭah, "al-Risālah al-awwalah (sic) fī al-thālūth al-muqaddas," pp. 4-10. The fragmentary *Kitāb al-ḥurūf* is itself most likely of Middle Eastern origin; see al-Qurṭubī, pp. 79-80.

⁴⁸ P. Devillard recognized this fact as well, though he did not go into any detail, pointing out only that the author of *Tathlūth al-waḥdānīyah* "s'inspire de la théologie musulmane des attributs. . ." ("Thèse sur al-Qurṭubī [introduction]," p. 74).

⁴⁹ *Tathlūth al-waḥdānīyah* in al-Qurṭubī, p. 71. See particularly here D. Gimaret's *Les noms divins en Islam*, passim, but esp. his index of the divine names on pp. 431-36; see also "al-asmā' al-husnā," EI² 1:714-17 [art. L. Gardet].

qādir (the Powerful), *baṣīr* (the Seeing)—are among the names of God which correspond to the fundamental attributes on which the debate on the attributes characteristically focused.⁵⁰ Aghushtīn likewise refers only to attributes that the *mutakallimūn* frequently discussed: power, knowledge, will, mercy, the ability to judge, the ability to punish.⁵¹ Like their Oriental Arab-Christian predecessors, moreover, the goal of both these Mozarabic writers is to demonstrate that all the attributes of God can be reduced to three: *qudrah* (power), *‘ilm* (knowledge), *irādah* (will). These in turn they both equate with the persons of the Trinity: Father, Son, Holy Spirit.

In a very substantial way, then, the author of *Tathlīth al-wahdānīyah* and Aghushtīn may rightly be considered representatives of a tradition of Christian *Kalām* in medieval Spain.⁵² Following in the footsteps of such Oriental Christians as Yahyā ibn ‘Adī, ‘Ammār al-Baṣrī, the author of the *Apology of al-Kindī*, and many others, these Mozarabic apologists participated deeply in the Arabic kalāmīc tradition. The apologetic method of those earlier and contemporary Oriental-Christian *mutakallimūn* consisted of, in the words of Sidney Griffith, defending “the traditional doctrines” of the Church “in an Arabic idiom which takes full account of the nuances” of the Qur’ān and the Kalām.⁵³ This is precisely the method adopted by these two Mozarabs. Moreover, of such

⁵⁰ It should be noted that the author of *Tathlīth al-wahdānīyah* does not distinguish adequately between the names of God, such as ‘*ālim* (“the Knowing”) and *baṣīr* (“the Seeing”), and His attributes on account of which He is referred to by those names, i. e. ‘*ilm* (“Knowledge”) and *baṣar* (“Sight”): he refers to both as simply *asmā’* (“names”), though the latter should, as we have seen, be referred to as *ṣifāt* (“attributes”). In this again, however, his thought is quite similar to Ibn Tūmart’s, for he also declined to use the term *ṣifah*, using only *ism* instead (see D. Urvoy, *Pensers d’al-Andalus*, p. 172, and M. Fletcher, “The Almohad Tawḥīd,” p. 116).

⁵¹ Aghushtīn in al-Qurṭubī, p. 82.

⁵² And in a sense, then, the continuators of a possible Mozarabic tradition of the study of Arabic philosophy, about which we have certain vague references in connection with the tenth-century Bishops Rabīʿ ibn Zayd and Abū al-Ḥārith; see D. Urvoy, *Pensers d’al-Andalus*, p. 172.

⁵³ S. Griffith, “The First *Summa Theologiae* in Arabic,” p. 19.

Christian *mutakallimūn* in Spain we do have other evidence. Ibn Rushd, who died in 1198, mentioned in his works that there were practitioners of the *mutakallimūn* to be found both “among the people of our religion [i.e. Islam] and the people of the Christian religion,” and in another passage wrote of such “*mutakallimūn* from among the people of the three religions which exist today.”⁵⁴

*

But while in their general character these Mozarabic arguments conform to this kalāmic, Oriental-Christian approach to demonstrating the Trinity, we must linger over one unusual feature of them—a feature which suggests that more than mere imitation of Oriental sources is at work here. Oriental Arab Christians used several different triads of attributes in their Trinitarian arguments. But none of them appear to have used the *particular* triad of power, knowledge, and will adopted by both the author of *Tathlith al-wahdānīyah* and Aghushtīn. According to Rachid Haddad, the Oriental-Christian triad closest to this Mozarabic triad is that of *jūd-hikmah-qudrah* (liberality-wisdom-power) adopted by Yahyā ibn ‘Adī and others.⁵⁵ Here wisdom (*hikmah*)—related of

⁵⁴ “Wa-hādhā huwa al-ra’y al-mashhūr ‘inda al-mutakallimīn min ahl millatinā wa-min ahl millat al-naṣārā.” “Huwa alladhī ṣayyara al-mutakallimīn min ahl al-milal al-thalāth al-mawjūdah al-yaum ilā al-qawl bi-annahu . . .” (Ibn Rushd, *Tafsīr mā ba’d al-ṭabī‘āt*, book Lam, ch. 18, [exp. 1070a, 27-30], pp. 1498, 1503). Cf. H. Wolfson, *Philosophy of the Kalam*, p. 2. The kalāmic nature of both the *Tathlith al-wahdānīyah* and the fragments of Aghushūn can be seen elsewhere in their works as well. When both authors demonstrate the possibility of incarnation by arguing that the Qur’ānic account of Moses at the burning bush implies this, their argumentation shows striking parallels to that of the Muslim *mutakallimūn* such as al-Ash‘arī who took a great interest in the same account of the burning bush because of its potentially problematic implications regarding the createdness or uncreatedness of the Qur’ān. See above chapter three, pp. 114-20; and cf. Abū al-Hasan al-Ash‘arī, *al-Ibānah ‘an uṣūl al-diyānah*, pp. 68-70; Tāj al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Wahhāb al-Subkī, *Ṭabaqāt al-shāfi‘īyah al-kubrā* 3, pp. 416-17; cf. D. Gimaret, *La doctrine d’al-Ash‘arī*, pp. 310-311, and W. Watt, *The Formative Period of Islamic Thought*, pp. 242-43, 281.

⁵⁵ R. Haddad, *La Trinité divine*, pp. 218-22, 233; for the other triads used by Oriental Arab-Christian writers see *ibid.*, pp. 208-33.

course to knowledge (*ilm*)—is ascribed to the second member of the Trinity just as knowledge is in the Andalusī triad. Power (*qudrah*), though used by these Oriental apologists, is ascribed to the Holy Spirit rather than to the Father. To the Father, on the other hand, is assigned liberality (*jūd*) which is not part of the Mozarabic triad at all. This triad, then, is remotely similar to the Mozarabic model.

In the second half of the eleventh century—the period just after that covered by Haddad in his survey of Arab-Christian Trinitarian theology—an Oriental Christian named Yaḥyá ibn Jarīr al-Takrītī adopted this same Oriental triad but reversed the first and third members, bringing us one step closer to the Mozarabic triad. In a still unpublished work entitled *al-Murshid (The Guide)*, Ibn Jarīr set forth a Trinitarian argument which is a very good example of the kalāmīc model just described, and is rather similar to the Mozarabic arguments in a number of ways: all attributes are shown to be reducible to just three—power (*qudrah*), wisdom (*ḥikmah*), and liberality (*jūd*)—and these three are shown to correspond to the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.⁵⁶ This *qudrah-ḥikmah-jūd* triad used in Ibn Jarīr's popular *al-Murshid*⁵⁷ is obviously rather similar to the Mozarabic *qudrah-ilm-irādah* triad; the only serious difference is between *jūd* (liberality) and *irādah* (will). But this is as close as we come to the Andalusī version.

It is, of course, conceivable that the Mozarabs simply derived their triad from Ibn Jarīr's, making the easy change from *ḥikmah* to *ilm* and, for whatever reason, substituting *irādah* for *jūd*. Yet Aghushtīn himself indicates very clearly that the origin of the Mozarabic triad was not in the Oriental-Christian milieu—whence he and other Mozarabs had learned so much—but in the Romance/Latin-speaking world; for he observes in a brief fragment quoted elsewhere by al-Qurṭubī that

⁵⁶ Yaḥyá ibn Jarīr al-Takrītī, *al-Murshid*, *bab* 6: "Fī šifāt al-bārī" (Vat. Borg. Ar. ms. 227, fols. 15r-17v and ff.). N. b. the striking and completely independent parallel between this triad and the earliest form of Peter Abelard's; see just below.

⁵⁷ It exists in at least 15 manuscripts; see *Bibliographie* 22.11, *Islamochristiana* 2 (1976):217.

the [attribute of] knowledge was only called the Son because of its relation to the [attribute of] power, since power is its source. And just as the conventional foreign manner of speaking came to be that the [attribute of] power which is the source is called Father, so also the conventional way of speaking in that language came to be that the knowledge pertaining to it is called Son.⁵⁸

The word which I have translated as “foreign” is *al-aʿjamī*. This word and the alternate form *al-ʿajamī*⁵⁹ both mean “barbarian” or “foreign” or “non-Arabic” depending on the context,⁶⁰ but in al-Andalus they usually referred to either the widely-spoken Romance vernacular or to Latin.⁶¹ Indeed, in *Tathlith al-*

⁵⁸ “Fa-hā huwa yaqūlu [Aghushūn] fī *Maṣḥaf al-ʿālam al-kāʾin*: ‘innamā summiya al-ʿilm ibnan bi-iqāfatihī ilā al-quḍrah idh al-quḍrah aṣluhu. Wa-kamā ṣāra al-taʿāruf al-aʿjamī an tusammā al-quḍrah allaḥi hiya al-aṣl wālidan ka-dhālika ṣāra al-taʿāruf fī dhālika al-lisān an tusammā al-ʿilm al-mansūbah ilayhā ibnan” (Aghushūn in al-Qurṭubī, p. 69). For this usage of *taʿāruf* to mean “conventional or technical manner of speaking” (a back-formation apparently from *ʿurf* in the sense of “custom” or “convention”) cf. R. Dozy, *Supplément 2*, p. 116 where ‘RF VI is defined among other things as “*employer un mot comme terme technique*,” but see esp. the passages in which both al-Qurṭubī and the author of *Tathlith al-waḥdānīyah* use it with precisely this meaning: “Wa-nuʿazzimuhu [ay Allāh] bi-mithl taʿāruḥinā fī al-ḥamd . . . li-mulūkinā” (*Tathlith al-waḥdānīyah* in al-Qurṭubī, p. 47); “Wa-lafẓ ‘al-jawhar’ fī al-mutaʿāraf ‘inda al-nuzzār wa-ghayrihim yuṭalliqūnahu ‘alā al-mutaḥayyiz wa-huwa al-jirm . . .” (al-Qurṭubī, p. 78). See also al-Qurṭubī, p. 237 where *mutaʿāraf* and *ʿurf* are used as synonyms.

⁵⁹ Aghushūn uses both forms interchangeably; see passage quoted in n. 63 just below.

⁶⁰ “étrangère” is P. Devillard’s translation here, though in parenthesis elsewhere he adds “le grec” without explanation; see his “Thèse sur al-Qurṭubī (translation),” pp. 40, 62.

⁶¹ See R. Dozy, *Supplément 2*, p. 98; F. Simonet, *Glosario*, pp. viii-ix. For its use to mean “Romance”, see J.-P. Molénat, “Quartiers et communautés à Tolède (XIIe-XVe siècles),” p. 182. For examples of it meaning “Latin” see F. Simonet, *Glosario*, p. xxv, nn. 1, 2; R. Dozy & C. Pellat, eds., *Le calendrier de Cordoue*, pp. 20-21 where the substantive form *al-ʿajam* is translated as *Latini* in this bi-lingual (Arabic-Latin) document; D. Dunlop, “Haḥḥ b. Albar,” p. 140, n. 2 and p. 146; and see especially the introduction to the Arabic translation of the Latin Psalms made by an Arabic-speaking Christian in Spain, where we are told that when the Greeks (*al-rūm*), the Jews, the “barbarians” (*al-ʿajam*), and others first believed, “they believed and prayed to their Lord in the language which they knew: whoever was Greek, in the Greek language (*al-rūmiyah*), whoever was Syrian in the Syriac language, and whoever was an ʿajamī in the Latin language (*al-Laṭīniyah*)” (Vat. Ar. 5, fol. 2r (p. 3), ll. 3-6 [my italics]; on this work see P. van Koningsveld, *The Latin-Arabic Glossary*, pp. 52-54). Indeed, Simonet (*Glosario*, p. xxvi, n. 2) argued that after the conquest of Toledo, Toledan

waḥdānīyah and al-Qurṭubī's rebuttal of it, *al-ʿajamī/al-ʿajamī* seems to mean Latin specifically.⁶² We may be almost certain, therefore, that these "foreigners" whose "conventional manner of speaking" is referred to here are speakers of Romance and/or Latin. The clear implication of this passage, then, is that the Mozarabic power-knowledge-will triad originated in the Romance/Latin milieu rather than in the Arabic world, and Aghushtīn has similar comments about the "foreign (i. e., Romance/Latin)" use of the triad elsewhere.⁶³

Because of this observation of Aghushtīn, and since we know that Mozarabs were taking an interest in Latin-Christian theology in any case, it is only natural that we look to Latin-Christian theology in order to help us understand this innovation. Indeed, the approach to the Trinity of *Tathlīth al-waḥdānīyah*, with its emphasis on psychological analogy, immediately suggests St. Augustine as a source: after all, one of the Latin manuscripts annotated in Arabic by a twelfth-century Mozarab contains the Bishop of Hippo's *De Trinitate*.⁶⁴

Mozarabs always meant "Latin" by *al-ʿajamī*; he gives several examples of the word used precisely in this way.

⁶² "Establish [the veracity of your faith] on the basis of the Torah in Hebrew and on the basis of the Gospel in *al-ʿajamī*" says the Mozarabic author to his Muslim readers (*Tathlīth al-waḥdānīyah* in al-Qurṭubī, p. 215). Now to a Mozarab—whose liturgical language was Latin and who almost certainly knew no Greek or Syriac—the "foreign language (*al-ʿajamī*)" in which one would find the Gospels would, of course, be Latin. A few pages later, al-Qurṭubī also strongly suggests that *al-ʿajamī* means "the Latin language" when he responds to this challenge by saying that he will recount what the Hebrew prophets said and what the Gospels say "just as the translators Jerome (*Yarūm*) and Ḥafṣ ibn Albar and others have translated them (al-Qurṭubī, p. 220)." The two names mentioned here are highly significant: Jerome, of course, was the translator of the Latin Vulgate, while Ḥafṣ translated the Latin Vulgate Psalms into Arabic (see ch. 1 above). The Bible that al-Qurṭubī seems to know, therefore, is that translated into Arabic by Ḥafṣ from the *al-ʿajamī* of Jerome—i. e. Latin.

⁶³ Cf. his similar statement made elsewhere his Trinitarian demonstration: "Fa-ḥādḥā qawlunā fī tathlīth alladhī waṣafahu al-injīl . . . wa-sammāhu bi-al-lisān al-ʿajamī al-ab wa-al-ibn wa-al-rūḥ al-quḍs" (Aghushtīn in al-Qurṭubī, p. 83).

⁶⁴ P. van Koningsveld, *The Latin-Arabic Glossary*, p. 50.

In fact, in his brief consideration of the sources of *Taḥlīth al-waḥdānīyah*, Paul Devillard suggested just this, although he did not point to any work in particular and suggested that the influence may well have come from some later writer of the Augustinian school.⁶⁵ Certain passages in Augustine's works are indeed similar to the Trinitarian argument of *Taḥlīth al-waḥdānīyah*. Though he used an extraordinary number of different triads to explain the nature of the Trinity, one of Augustine's favorite and most famous triads—*memoria-intelligentia-uoluntas*—is a good example of this similarity: *memoria* (memory), of course, is quite a different thing from *qudrah* (power), but *intelligentia* (intelligence) and *ʿilm* (knowledge or perception), while by no means synonyms, can both mean the same thing in certain contexts; *uoluntas* and *irādah* are completely equivalent. In *De vera religione* Augustine used another triad rather similar to that used by our Mozarabs: *Dei virtus* (or *Dei principium*), *Dei sapientia*, and *Dei munus* (or *Dei donum*), that is, the strength (or originating principle) of God, the wisdom of God, and the gift of God.⁶⁶ Moreover, Augustine uses these and other triads to form psychological analogies for the Trinity, such as when he observes that while memory, intelligence, and will are distinct faculties in man, they are, nevertheless, interrelated and dependent on each other: "These three, *memoria*, *intelligentia*, *uoluntas*, because they are not three lives, but one life, and not three minds but one mind, consequently are certainly not three substances but one substance."⁶⁷

Nevertheless, the two Augustinian triads of *memoria-intelligentia-uoluntas*—which incidentally was repeated by Isidore, another of the Latin Fathers studied by the Mozarabs of Spain⁶⁸—and *Dei virtus-Dei sapientia-Dei munus* are the closest parallels to

⁶⁵ P. Devillard, "Thèse sur al-Qurṭubī (introduction)," p. 75.

⁶⁶ Augustine, *De vera religione* 55.110-113, CCSL 32:257-60.

⁶⁷ "Haec igitur tria, memoria, intelligentia, uoluntas, quoniam non sunt tres uitae sed una uita, nec tres mentes sed una mens, consequenter utique nec tres substantiae sunt sed una substantia" (Augustine, *De Trinitate* 10. 11. 18, CCSL 50:330, ll. 29-32).

⁶⁸ See his *Etymologies* 7. 4; cf. P. van Koningsveld, *The Latin-Arabic Glossary*, pp. 45-46, 50.

the Mozarabic *qudrah-‘ilm-irādah* triad that we find. Oliver Du Roy prepared an exhaustive list of the triads which Augustine used to explain the Trinity, and although this list contains some 115 different triads, the Mozarabic triad of power, knowledge, and will is not among them.⁶⁹

Remarkably enough, however, and in confirmation of Devilard's suspicion that *Taḥlīṯ al-waḥdānīyah*'s author relied on later Augustinian writers, a Latin triad very similar to the Mozarabic *qudrah-‘ilm-irādah* shows up in numerous Latin-Christian treatises on the Trinity beginning just before 1120, and a triad corresponding precisely to it can be found very soon after. In a work known as the *Theologia 'summi boni'* written between 1118 and 1120, Peter Abelard argued at length that to each person of the Trinity there was one divine attribute which, though it was common to all members of the Trinity, was assigned to it in some special way: *potentia* or power to the Father, *sapientia* or wisdom to the Son, and *benignitas* or benevolence to the Holy Spirit.⁷⁰ In asserting this view of the Trinity, Abelard claimed to be following the view of the Church fathers, but it is fairly certain that he was the first to use exactly this triad in explaining the nature of the Godhead.⁷¹ He employed it at great length in later works, and was even attacked vociferously by other theologians for the manner in which he used it, some of his teachings eventually being condemned by the church.⁷² Yet this triad soon became nearly a com-

⁶⁹ O. Du Roy, *L'Intelligence de la foi*, pp. 537-40.

⁷⁰ See P. Abelard, *Theologia 'summi boni'* 1. 1-5, CCCM 13:86-103). It is quite intriguing that we find Abelard independently devising a Latin triad which corresponds almost exactly to the Arabic triad discussed previously in this chapter and devised at a slightly earlier date by the Iraqi Christian Yaḥyā Ibn Jarīr—*qudrah-ḥikmah-jūd*—, and to find them both using it for the same Trinitarian purposes. This is a striking reminder of how intellectuals separated by rather daunting barriers of space and language, but possessing the same religious heritage and largely the same philosophical and theological heritage, can nevertheless think along very similar paths.

⁷¹ See J. Châtillon, "Unitas, aequalitas, concordia vel connexio," pp. 359-64 and ff., esp. n. 98. This triad is, of course, certainly very reminiscent of the *Dei virtus-Dei sapientia-Dei munus* triad of Augustine discussed just above.

⁷² See E. Buytaert, "Abelard's Trinitarian Doctrine," passim; C. Mews, "The Development of the Theologia of Peter Abelard," passim; and also J. Hofmeier, *Die Trinitätslehre des Hugo von St. Viktor*, pp. 70-75.

monplace in theological writings throughout Europe. Major theologians such as Peter Lombard (d. 1160), Hugh of St. Victor (d. 1141), Gilbert de la Porrée (d. 1154), St. Bonaventure (d. 1274), and Thomas Aquinas (d. 1274) all prominently employed exactly this power-wisdom-benevolence triad.⁷³ So popular was the use of this triad in explaining the Trinity that it even found its way into a thirteenth-century French verse disputation between a Christian and a Jew: "The Power is the Father who made all things without matter;/ the Intelligence is the Son who descended from the Father;/ the Goodness of both is the Holy Spirit."⁷⁴

Now we are very close here to the Mozarabic triad of *qudrah*, *'ilm*, and *irādah*, closer than it might seem on the surface. The Latin *potentia* corresponds thoroughly to *qudrah*, both meaning "power." *Sapientia* (wisdom) and *'ilm* (knowledge) might seem to be only partly related at first, but the Mozarabs appear to have conceived of these two words as more-or-less equivalent since the twelfth-century Mozarabic *Glossarium latino-arabicum* defines *sapientia* as *'ilm* or *ḥikmah* (wisdom), in that order.⁷⁵ Moreover, some followers of Abelard in the use of the power-wisdom-benevolence triad frequently used *scientia* (knowledge), which corresponds even more closely to *'ilm*, in place of *sapientia* or used them interchangeably, as did Hugh of St. Victor.⁷⁶

Benignitas (benevolence), however, seems to present a problem: it does not correspond in any obvious way to *irādah*. Yet in

⁷³ The bibliography here is considerable, but J. Châtillon, "Unitas, aequalitas, concordia vel connexio," pp. 359-79 provides the best overview. For Bonaventure see his *In IV sent.*, 1. I, dist. 35, q. 3 (Quaracchi, 1882, p. 512). Cf. also Dante's *Inferno* 3, ll. 4-6 where the Trinity is also described in the terms of Abelard's triad.

⁷⁴ "Li pooirs est li peres qui tot fist sanz matere,/ Li sens ce est li filz qui descendi du pere,/ La bontez d'ambedeus c'est li sainz esperites" ("Desputoison du juyf et du crestien," ed. H. Pflaum in "Poems of Religious Disputations in the Middle Ages," [Hebrew], *Tarbiz* 2 (5691 [1930-31]):473, ll. 359-61). For the date of the poem, see *ibid.*, p. 458. Cf. D. Lasker, *Jewish Philosophical Polemics*, pp. 64, 204.

⁷⁵ *Glossarium*, p. 453.

⁷⁶ "Et haec tria erant potentia, sapientia, voluntas Voluntas movet, scientia disponit, potestas operatur" (Hugh of St. Victor, *De sacramentis* 1. 2. 6, PL 176:208b-c).

Theologia 'summi boni' Abelard often substituted for it not only such near-equivalents as *bonitas* (goodness) but also such phrases as *affectus benignitatis*, *affectus bonus*, and *affectus caritatis* for *bonitas*—*affectus* meaning “disposition” or “desire” or even “good-will.”⁷⁷ Now “desire of benevolence,” “good desire,” and “desire of love,” respectively, are much closer to *irādah* (will), and soon Abelard and his followers took the next logical step, frequently using the exact Latin equivalent for *irādah*, i. e., *voluntas* (will) or *bona voluntas* (good will), in place of *benignitas*.⁷⁸ William of Conches (d. 1145), for example—one of the theologians who, along with Abelard, was attacked bitterly for his use of this triad—wrote that,

There is therefore in the divinity power, wisdom, and will (*voluntas*). Holy men refer to these three as persons, transferring [to them] words from everyday speech according to a certain affinity, calling power the Father, wisdom the Son, will (*voluntas*) the Holy Spirit. . . . The divine will (*voluntas*) is called the Spirit, for it is properly the Spirit of desire.⁷⁹

The justification for this replacement of the attribute of kindness (*benignitas*) or goodness (*bonitas*) with the attribute of will (*voluntas*) was concisely spelled out by another follower of Abelard in the use of this triad, Richard of St. Victor (d. 1173): “What is goodness (*bonitas*),” he wrote, “but good will (*voluntas*)?”⁸⁰ In fact *benignitas*, *bonitas*, and *voluntas* were just

⁷⁷ Abelard *Theologia 'summi boni'* 1.5.17, CCCM 13:92, ll. 160-65.

⁷⁸ See Abelard, *Theologia 'scholarium' (recensiones breuiiores)* 39, CCCM 12:416, ll. 437-40 (this was written c. 1135-36; see the editor's. introduction, *ibid.*, p. 392).

⁷⁹ “Est ergo in divinitate potentia, sapientia et voluntas. Has tres sancti personas vocant, vocabula a vulgari propter affinitatem quamdam transferrentes, potentiam appellantes Patrem, sapientiam Filium, voluntatem Spiritum sanctum. . . . Voluntas . . . divina dicitur Spiritus. Est enim proprie spiritus anhelitus” (as quoted by William of St. Thierry, in his *De erroribus Guillelmi de Conchis*, PL 180:333c). For further examples see Hugh of St. Victor, *De sacramentis* 1. 2. 6 & 1. 3. 28, PL 176:208b-c, 230d-231a.

⁸⁰ “Quid est enim bonitas nisi bona voluntas,” Richard of St. Victor, *De Trinitate* 6. 15, p. 418. The same sentence appears in his *De tribus appropriatis personis in Trinitate*, PL 196:994b. Cf. Abelard in the mid-1130's: “Vbi uero haec tria conueniunt, ut tam uidelicet potentia quam sapientia quam *bona uoluntate* sit perfectus, nihil boni est quod eius plenitudini desit” *Theologia 'scholarium' (recensiones breuiiores)* 39, CCCM 12:416, ll. 437-40).

three of a cluster of attributes, all subsumed in the general notion of God's beneficent will, any of which could be used as the third member of this triad; others included *benignitas* (beneficence), *amor* (love), and *caritas* (love). Hugh of St. Victor, for example, used several of these attributes, including *voluntas*, in a nearly interchangeable way in his *De sacramentis*, written in the late 1130's.⁸¹

It is not at all difficult, therefore, to find twelfth-century Latin theologians using the triad *potentia-scientia-voluntas*, corresponding exactly to the *qudrah-'ilm-irādah* triad adopted by the author of *Tahtlith al-wahdāntyah* and Aghushṭīn, and to find it used in precisely the same manner. Hugh of St. Victor, for example, wrote that

A certain three things existed [in God] and these three were one, and these three were eternal, and nothing was able to be perfected without these three If one of these were absent, nothing would be able to be completed. And these three were power, wisdom, will Will moves, knowledge disposes, power acts.⁸²

Just as do the Mozarabic authors, moreover, Hugh ascribes these three attributes to the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit respectively.⁸³

⁸¹ Examples: "Attribuitur Patri potentia, et Filio sapientia, et Spiritui sancto bonitas sive benignitas" (Hugh of St. Victor, *De sacramentis* 1. 3. 26, PL 176:227c). A few pages later he makes *amor* and *bonitas* equivalent when he describes how this triad in the human soul is a *signum Trinitatis*: "Foris autem potentia non erat, sed signum tantum; neque sapientia sed signum tantum; neque *amor vel bonitas*, sed signum tantum . . ." (Hugh of St. Victor, *De sacramentis* 1. 3. 28, PL 176:230c). While *voluntas* is never expressly made equivalent with the *amor*, *benignitas*, and *bonitas*, this is the clear implication. Just three sentences after writing "Voluntas movet, scientia disponit, potestas operatur," Hugh substitutes *bonitas* for *voluntas* without explanation when he restates his triad: "Quidquid de Deo vere dicitur, aut pie credi potest in Deo, haec tria continent; potestas, sapientia et bonitas" (Hugh of St. Victor, *De sacramentis* 1. 2. 6, PL 176:208b-c).

⁸² "Erant enim tria quaedam, et haec tria erant unum; et aeterna erant tria haec; et nihil perfectum esse poterat sine his tribus . . . si deesset de his tribus unum, aliquid consummatum esse non posset. Et haec tria erant potentia, sapientia, voluntas Voluntas movet, scientia disponit, potestas operatur" (Hugh of St. Victor, *De sacramentis* 1. 2. 6, PL 176:208b-c; cf. a very similar passage in 1. 3. 28, c. 230d-231a). Interestingly enough Ramon Martí, the great Dominican missionary whose connections with twelfth-century Mozarabic apologists I will discuss in ch. 6, also employed this triad to explain the Trinity. See his *Explanatio simboli*, pp. 460-61.

⁸³ See Hugh of St. Victor, *De sacramentis* 1. 3. 6, PL 176:227c.

Abelard's triad of *potentia-sapientia-bonitas*, therefore, and its variants, including *potentia-scientia-voluntas*, were in wide circulation in Latin works on the Trinity during most of the twelfth century and beyond. The Mozarabic triad of *qudrah-ʿilm-irādah*, however, which corresponds precisely to the latter variant of Abelard's triad, is new to Arab-Christian literature. Since we know that these Mozarabs were familiar with Latin-Christian thought, and since Aghushtīn indicates quite clearly that this Arabic triad originated in the Latin-Christian milieu, it can hardly be doubted that *Tathlīth al-wahdānīyah*'s author and Aghushtīn both adopted their triad from Peter Abelard and his followers. These two Mozarabic *mutakallimūn* of Spain, therefore, were introducing Latin thought into the Arabic tradition of *Kalām*.

*

It must be stressed that this appropriation of a widely popular Latin idea for use in Christian apologetic in Arabic was not merely an instance of rather passive borrowing by these Mozarabic writers. Rather we have here two examples of a lively and insightful adaptation of the Abelardian triad, for the Latin terms and concepts involved here were not merely translated from one language to another: they were also translated from one intellectual tradition to another. To see that this is so, it is only necessary to notice that although the author of *Tathlīth al-wahdānīyah* and Aghushtīn could have translated Abelard's triad in a number of different ways, they chose exactly that translation which would place their discussion of the Trinity squarely within the kalāmīc discussion of God's attributes.

This last point requires a certain amount of explanation. In the same way that the doctors of *Kalām* and the philosophers in the Arab world were perennially preoccupied with the problem of attributes, so also were medieval Latin-Christian intellectuals.⁸⁴

⁸⁴ In the case of twelfth-century Latin Christians, God's attributes were widely discussed in connection with the so-called problem of appropriation; see J. Chollet, "Appropriation (aux personnes de la Sainte Trinité)," DTC 1/2:1708-17.

But when twelfth-century Latin Christians discussed this problem, they did not concentrate on precisely the same group of names and attributes which preoccupied the intellectuals of the Arab world. A typical twelfth-century Christian list of the important attributes of God included the following: eternity, power, knowledge, will, goodness, love, piety, unchangeability, justice, mercy, and foreknowledge.⁸⁵ Compare it with the attributes deemed most fundamental by the great orthodox *mutakallim* al-Ash'arī: life, knowledge, power, will, sight, hearing, eternity, and speech.⁸⁶ Evidently some attributes are common to both traditions—power, eternity, knowledge, etc.; but there are a certain number such as “goodness” and “sight” which are unique to one or the other.⁸⁷

Now as we have seen, our Mozarabic authors were faced with several variants of the general triad first employed by Peter Abelard. While the first member was always *potentia*, the second two were variable: either *sapientia* or *scientia* for the middle member, and a choice of *bonitas*, *benignitas*, *amor*, *caritas*, *affectus bonus*, *affectus benignitatis*, *voluntas*, and others for the third. Moreover, for each of these Latin words, there was usually more than one possible Arabic translation, and the twelfth-century Latin-Arabic glossary, produced in exactly the same milieu as our sources,⁸⁸ gives us a very clear idea of what Arabic words were thought to correspond to them, since it contains an entry for each of these Latin words. *Bonitas* and *benignitas*, for example, are listed together and defined in Arabic as *ḥusn* (beauty), *iḥsān* (beneficence), *jūd* (generosity), *karam* (generosity-kindness), and *ḥilm* (clemency). *Affectus*, used so frequently by Abelard, is

⁸⁵ This is taken from the anonymous *Sententie Parisiensis* (written c. 1139-41) *pars* 1 (ed. A. Landgraff in *Écrits théologiques de l'école d'Abélard*, pp. xxxix-xl, p. 12) and see J. Chollet, “Appropriation (aux personnes de la Sainte Trinité),” DTC 1/2:1708-17.

⁸⁶ See D. Gimaret, *La doctrine d'al-Ash'arī*, pp. 259-67 and ff.

⁸⁷ The differences largely arise out of factors peculiar to each tradition. For example, the attributes of sight (*baṣar*) and hearing (*sam'*) are important in the Arabic world because the Qur'ān explicitly describes God as “The Seeing” and “The Hearing,” while the attribute of love is important for Latin Christians because the book of 1 John explicitly says that “God is love.”

⁸⁸ P. van Koningsveld, *The Latin-Arabic Glossary*, pp. 64-65.

defined as *hawan* (affection, passion, desire), *shafā'ah* (mediation, advocacy), and *maḥabbah* (love, affection), which is also the definition provided for *amor* and *karitas*. *Voluntas* is defined as *mashī'ah* (will), *irādah* (will), *hawan* (affection, etc.), and *ntyah* (intention).⁸⁹

Not only, therefore, did these Mozarabic writers have a variety of slightly different Latin triads to choose from if they wanted to use Abelard's approach to explaining the Trinity, but they also had an even larger number of possible Arabic terms with which to translate this variety of triads. We know, of course, that they chose the three Arabic words *qudrah*, *'ilm*, and *irādah* corresponding to *potentia*, *sapientia* (or perhaps *scientia*), and *voluntas*. It is not hard to see why: the Mozarabic writers wanted to use only Arabic terms which were regularly part of the discussion of attributes by the *mutakallimūn* and Arabic philosophers. The Arabic terms such as *ḥusn* (beauty), *iḥsān* (beneficence, generosity), *maḥabbah* (love, affection), and *hawan* which correspond to *bonitas*, *benignitas*, *affectus*, *amor*, etc. are not normally listed among the fundamental attributes of God in Arabic works on this topic, whether by Muslims or Jews: but *irādah*, and it alone among the possible Arabic translations of *voluntas*, is almost invariably found in such discussions. Therefore using *irādah* to correspond to *voluntas* was the only possible choice for the third member of the triad. Likewise the Latin-Arabic glossary makes clear that *sapientia* could be translated by at least two Arabic words, *'ilm* and *ḥikmah*, while *scientia* could be translated by *ma'rifah*. Of these, *'ilm* is the attribute most commonly listed among the fundamental attributes of God, and therefore it became the second member of the Mozarabic triad. *Qudrah* translating *potentia* is always considered one of the fundamental attributes.⁹⁰ Therefore, of all the possible Arabic translations suggested by the Latin-Arabic glossary for the several Latin versions of Abelard's

⁸⁹ *Glossarium*, pp. 12, 20, 43, 278, 543.

⁹⁰ For *potentia* the glossary actually lists only *iqtidār*, which is virtually a synonym of *qudrah*, but the author of *Tathlith al-wahdāntyah* and Aghushūn chose the latter because it is normally the form used in Arabic discussions of the attributes. See *Glossarium*, p. 391.

triad, *qudrah-ilm-irādah* best manages to translate Abelard's triad, drawn from the Latin-Christian debate on attributes, into terms regularly used in the Arabic debate on this problem. Indeed it should be noticed that the Ash'arite *mutakallimūn* often specially group these three particular attributes together at the beginning of their treatments of the problem of the attributes,⁹¹ so that Muslims were probably accustomed to seeing them as a set. This would make their use by Christian polemicists even more striking. Moreover, it is not merely the great doctors of *Kalām* such as al-Ash'arī who include these three specific attributes⁹² among the most basic attributes of God; many of the great Muslim and Jewish philosophers of al-Andalus in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, such as Ibn Ḥazm, Ibn Ṭufayl, Abraham Ibn Ezra, and Maimonides, include them as well.⁹³

*

The author of *Tathlīth al-waḥdānīyah* and Aghushtīn, therefore, did more than find Arabic equivalents for the Abelardian triad; they adapted that triad to the Arabic intellectual tradition. But in addition to showing that these two Mozarabic *mutakallimūn* borrowed and adapted this Latin triad, it is also possible to show that the author of *Tathlīth al-waḥdānīyah*, at least, also adopted other elements of the Latin argumentation associated with that triad. Certain further remarkable parallels between *Tathlīth al-waḥdānīyah* and the works of Abelard himself and Hugh of St. Victor make this particularly clear. We should not be surprised to

⁹¹ See D. Gimaret, *Le doctrine d'al-Ash'arī*, pp. 260-61 and ff., 309.

⁹² See above, p. 169.

⁹³ On Ibn Ḥazm see M. Cruz Hernández, *Historia de la filosofía hispano-musulmana* 1, pp. 261-63; see also Ibn Ṭufayl (who leaves out *irādah*), *Ḥayy ibn Yaqzān*, p. 91 (cf. Cruz Hernández *ibid.*, pp. 410-411); Abraham ibn Ezra's *The Exalted Faith* does not survive in its original Arabic version, but Solomon ibn Labī's medieval Hebrew version uses the corresponding Hebrew attributes (see *The Exalted Faith* 2. 3, trans. N. Samuelson, [Cranbury NJ, 1986], pp. 152-53; cf. Husik, *Medieval Jewish Philosophy*, p. 221); see also Maimonides, *Dalālat al-Ḥā'irīn* 1. 56; 1, p. 68a-b.

find parallels with the works of these two theologians in particular, since Abelard's influence was vast throughout twelfth-century Europe;⁹⁴ Hugh, who was known in his day as "the Second Augustine,"⁹⁵ was similarly influential.⁹⁶

First of all, in order to explain how this triad of attributes operates in concert in God, the *Tathlith al-wahdānīyah* employed an analogy based on how they operate in men:

Just as we understand that no action of the soul of a man can come to be without three things [i. e. power, knowledge, will]—if one of them is lacking, then an action cannot be completed for him, and if a fourth is added among them, it will not harmonise—

so also no divine action can come to be without all three working together in God. For in this, God is just like a man for whom

If one of [the three] is incapacitated, then the act will not be completed by the remaining two: for if He knows and wills and is not able, then He will be incapable [of the act], and if He is able and knows and does not will, then nothing will be completed for Him except through will, and if He is able and does not know, an act will not be complete for Him in ignorance.⁹⁷

Abelard used psychological analogies quite like this in his works. A good example is the following passage from his *Theologia christiana* (and here *benignitas* [goodness] is used in place of *voluntas*):

The entire perfection of the good, therefore, consists in three, that is, power, wisdom, goodness, and each of them is to be considered of little value without the other two. For his power is fatal and

⁹⁴ Here see D. Luscombe, *The School of Peter Abelard*, passim.

⁹⁵ And the "new Augustine;" see J. Vernet, "Hugues de Saint-Victor," DTC 7/1:290, and J. de Ghellinck, *Le mouvement théologique du XIIe siècle*, p. 185, n. 2.

⁹⁶ See J. de Ghellinck, *Le mouvement théologique du XIIe siècle*, pp. 185-97, esp. 195. On his influence in his day see J. de Ghellinck, *ibid.*, p. 195, and esp. R. Goy, *Die Überlieferung der Werke Hugos von St. Viktor*, passim, and esp. pp. 509-12.

⁹⁷ "Wa-kamā annā qad fahamnā anna nafs al-insān la yaqūmu la-hā fi'l illā 'an thalāthah. In naqaṣa min-hā wāḥid lam yaṭimmi la-hu fi'l wa-in zāda fī-hā rābi' lam yattafiq . . . fa-in 'ajazat min-hā wāḥidah lam yaṭimmi bi-al-ithnayn fi'l li-annahu in 'alima wa-arāda wa-lam yaqdir fa-qad 'ajaza wa-in qadara wa-'alama wa-lam yurīd (sic) fa-lā yaṭimmi la-hu shay' illā bi-al-irādah wa-in qadara wa-lam ya'lam lam yaṭimmi la-hu fi'l bi-al-jahl" (*Tathlith al-wahdānīyah* in al-Qurṭubī, p. 71).

pernicious who is able but does not know how to carry out that which he is able to do according to the proper measure of reason. But if he is wise and discreet in acting, but is by no means able, he will lack efficacy.⁹⁸

Passages like this can be found in other Latin works as well, notable among them Hugh of St. Victor's *De sacramentis christianae fidei*,⁹⁹ but these sentences from Abelard are particularly similar to the passage from *Tathlith al-wahdāntiyah* and thus recommend themselves as a possible source.

Hugh's *De sacramentis* is a likely source for another important passage in *Tathlith al-wahdāntiyah*. When its author responds to the objection that God is called many other things besides the Powerful, the Knowing, and the Willing, such as Mighty, Seeing, Forgiving, and so forth, he observes that

These [three names] which we have recounted are the origins of all naming [of God], and from [these three the other names] proceed and in them they are incorporated. For the origin of Mighty, and Potent, and Victorious, and Conquering and similar things is Power and from it they proceed and in it they are incorporated. The origin of Forgiving, and Merciful, and Consenting, and Angry, and Punisher is Will; from it they proceed and in it they are incorporated.¹⁰⁰

Once again, more than one twelfth-century Latin source contains a passage similar to this,¹⁰¹ but the closest parallel is in Hugh's *De*

⁹⁸ "In his itaque tribus, potentia, scilicet, sapientia, benignitate, tota boni perfectio consistit ac parui pendendum est quodlibet horum sine duobus aliis. Qui enim potens est, sed id quod potest iuxta modum rationis conducere nescit, exitialis est ac perniciosa eius potentia. Si autem sapiens sit et discretus in agendo, sed minime possit, efficacia caret" (Abelard, *Theologia christiana* 1. 5., CCCM 12:74, ll. 59-64). Cf. id. *Theologia 'summi boni'* 1. 2. 3, CCCM 13:87, ll. 24-37.

⁹⁹ Hugh of St. Victor, *De sacramentis* 1. 3. 27, PL 176:229b

¹⁰⁰ "Hādhihi allatī dhakarnāhā hiya uṣūl jamīʿ al-tasmīyah wa-min-hā tanbathiqu wa-fi-hā tandaghimu. fa-ʿazīz wa-qawī wa-ghalūb wa-qāhīr wa-mā ashbahahā aṣluhā al-qudrah wa-min-hā tanbathiqu wa-fi-hā tandaghimu; wa-ghafūr wa-raḥīm wa-rādī wa-sākhiṭ wa-muʿāqib aṣluhā al-irādah; min-hā tanbathiqu wa-fi-hā tandaghimu" (*Tathlith al-wahdāntiyah* in al-Qurṭubī, p. 71). For some reason the author does not state which names are incorporated in Knowledge (ʿilm).

¹⁰¹ See especially the anonymous *Sententie Parisiensis* written between 1139 and 1141: "In quibus videndum est, si contineatur descriptio summi boni, quia sunt adhuc multa, que de Deo predicantur, ut est eternus, incommutabilis, iustus, pius, misericors. Sed sciendum, quod ista omnia clauduntur sub tribus predictis, scilicet potentia, sapientia, bonitate . . . Hoc, quod eternus est,

sacramentis. When he demonstrates that all the other possible names and attributes of God are subsumed in Abelard's triad, Hugh observes in rather similar language that:

Whatever is said about God and believed truly about God is reduced to these three. If you call [Him] strong and uncorrupt and unchangeable and invincible and other things which are similar, all this belongs to [His] power; if provident, if inspector, if examiner of things which are hidden, and intelligent, all this belongs to [His] wisdom; if pious, if mild, if merciful, if patient, all this belongs to [His] goodness. And . . . all which is perfect and true is contained in these.¹⁰²

These two examples of further similarities between *Taḥlīṭh al-wahdānīyah* and the works of Abelard and Hugh, in addition to demonstrating how the author of the former work borrowed other elements of the Latin argumentation associated with the Abelardian triad, may even suggest that those two writers in particular may have been among the specific proximate sources of the work. Hugh's works were certainly known in the Iberian peninsula in the twelfth century,¹⁰³ and it is instructive to note how often works by both authors can be found copied together in the same twelfth-century manuscripts throughout Europe.¹⁰⁴ Furthermore, it must be stressed that both authors expressed interest in converting unbelievers. In about 1140 Hugh wrote a letter to Archbishop John of Seville, castigating him for not openly proclaiming the teachings of the Church in Islamic Spain,¹⁰⁵ while Abelard saw his own triad as having great value to missionaries:

attribuitur potentie . . . Ad potentiam quoque pertinet hoc, quod est incommutabilis. Providentia vero sive prescientia sapientie ascribitur . . . Iustitia, pietas, misericordia ad bonitatem pertinent . . . " (*pars* 1, ed. A. Landgraff, *Écrits théologiques de l'école d'Abélard*, p. 12, ll. 2-13.).

¹⁰² "Et quaecunque de Deo dicuntur, et creduntur veraciter in Deo: ad haec tria referuntur . . . Si enim fortem dicis et incorruptum et incommutabilem et invincibilem et caetera quae similia sunt, hic totum hoc potentiae est; si providum, si inspectorem, si scrutantem occulta, et intelligentem, hoc totum sapientiae est; si pium, si mansuetum, si misericordem, si patientem, totum hoc bonitatis est. Et . . . totum in his continetur quod perfectum est et verum" (Hugh of St. Victor, *De sacramentis* 1. 3. 29, PL 176:231a-b).

¹⁰³ See R. Goy, *Die Überlieferung der Werke Hugos von St. Viktor*, pp. 530-32.

¹⁰⁴ See here J. Tolan, *Petrus Alfonsi*, pp. 111-12, and E. Buytaert's introduction to his edition of Abelard's *Theologia christiana*, CCCM 12:18-20.

¹⁰⁵ See his *Epistola (III) ad Joannem Hispalensem archiepiscopum*, PL

Wherefore this division of the Trinity [into power, wisdom, and goodness] is not only suited to describing the perfection of the highest good, but it also is abundantly advantageous for persuading men of the [true] religion of divine worship.¹⁰⁶

In this missionary interest, both theologians are representative of the growing Latin-Christian concern with the conversion of unbelievers outside of Christendom, a concern which culminated in 1142 when Peter the Venerable came to Spain and, with mission to the Muslims very much in mind, commissioned the translation of the famous Cluniac Corpus.¹⁰⁷

In any case, it is clear that the presence of the Abelardian triad and other Latin ideas associated with it in *Tathlith al-wahdāntyah* and the fragments of Aghushtīn is not merely a result of these works being written in a partly Latin milieu: it is also a consequence of that Latin religious revival which was spreading into the Mozarabic community in Spain during the twelfth century as that community was coming ever-more fully under Christian rule and becoming ever-more integrated into Latin society. In the hybrid thought of these two Mozarabic *mutakallimūn*, we have perhaps the clearest example, therefore, of how the increasing integration of the Mozarabic community into Latin-Christian society subsequent to the conquest of Toledo served in the first instance to stimulate this community culturally. The great irony, of course, is that by the late thirteenth century (or thereabout), the Latin-Christian influences that had initially stimulated Mozarabic culture had begun to completely overwhelm it so that in the course of the next century, these Arabic-speaking Christians would become completely assimilated to the Latin milieu.¹⁰⁸ This fact

176:1014-18; cf. J. O'Callaghan, "The Mudejars of Castile and Portugal," p. 48.

¹⁰⁶ "Vnde non solum haec Trinitatis distinctio ad summi boni perfectionem describendum conuenit, uerum etiam ad persuadendam hominibus diuini cultus religionem plurimum proficit" (Abelard, *Theologia christiana* 1. 6. CCCM 12:74, ll. 75-77).

¹⁰⁷ See J. Kritzeck, *Peter the Venerable and Islam*, passim. This twelfth-century interest in conversion of Muslims in many ways anticipated the great missionary endeavors of the thirteenth century. See B. Kedar, *Crusade and Mission*, ch. 4, esp. pp. 133-34.

¹⁰⁸ On this process see chapter one above.

naturally raises the question of what legacy—if any—of the Mozarabic approach to Islam survived this process of acculturation. That question will be the central concern of the following concluding chapter.

CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSION

Among the most interesting problems posed by the history of the Christian communities living under Islamic rule in the Middle Ages is why the various Oriental churches survived down to the present while the church of North Africa, an area just as heavily Christianized by the arrival of Islam, disappeared totally in the late medieval period.¹ The traditional explanation for this disappearance was that the intolerance of the Alhomads destroyed what was left of that North-African Christian population. But, as Mohamed Talbi has cogently argued recently, the continued survival of the North-African Jewish community in the same circumstances makes it very difficult to sustain this view. Why did they survive and not the Christians? In Talbi's view, therefore, it was not primarily external pressures that brought about the disappearance of the North-African church, but internal weaknesses:

The Christianity of Africa . . . withered and was finally snuffed out like a lamp deprived of oil, not because it was confronted by more severe difficulties than other [Christian communities under Islam], but because it did not know how, or was not able, to find in its bosom the intellectual resources indispensable for its survival.²

It is doubtless true that the Christians of Africa lacked the intellectual tradition of their correlative in the Middle East. Of the enormous number of religious polemical and apologetic works written by Christians in Arabic in the Middle Ages, not one, as Talbi points out, was written in North Africa. Moreover, unlike the African Jews who wrote in Arabic and immersed themselves in a variety of ways in Arab culture, the Christians of Africa failed, so far as we know, to develop anything like a specifically Arab-Christian culture. Because of these deficiencies, the North-African

¹ This question has been newly raised and penetratingly, though necessarily tentatively, answered in M. Talbi's recent study, "Le Christianisme maghrébin," *passim*.

² M. Talbi, "Le Christianisme maghrébin," pp. 330-31.

church was not able to maintain itself in the face of the gradual conversion of its members to Islam, and so had suffered a devastating collapse by the beginning of the twelfth century and had disappeared completely by the end of the Middle Ages.³

This admittedly tentative theory devised by Talbi is not by any means immune from criticism, de-emphasizing as it does the social and political circumstances of the North-African Christians which may well have contributed in important ways to their collapse as a viable community.⁴ But it nevertheless provides us with a valuable perspective from which to evaluate the trajectory of Mozarabic history. For if we survey the Mozarabic community during the first half of the eleventh century, we are likely to come to the conclusion that it too was on the verge of collapsing, in part, at least, because of a similar failure to develop the intellectual resources required for continued survival. Compared to the eleventh-century Andalusī Jews, as David Wasserstein has observed, the contemporaneous Mozarabs appear to have been “extremely depressed” culturally in the Taifa period.⁵ They do not appear to have shared in Arab-Islamic culture in the way contemporary Jews did. As we have seen, there is a striking gap in the production of Mozarabic religious-apologetic literature in Arabic between the lifetime of Ḥafṣ ibn Albar (fl. 889) and the writing of *Liber denudationis* in the later eleventh century.⁶ Similarly, there was a steep decline in the Mozarabic translation of Latin works into Arabic after the tenth century when Aṣḥabagh ibn Nabīl translated and expanded Orosius’ *Historiae* and Ishāq ibn Balashk translated the Latin Gospels.⁷

³ M. Talbi, “Le Christianisme maghrébin,” pp. 330-31, 337, 343-44.

⁴ M. Dall’Arche, for example, in his *Scomparsa del Cristianesimo ed espansione dell’Islam nell’Africa settentrionale*, pp. 213-15, argues that the ecclesiastical weakness of the North African church, and especially its lack of bishops, was an essential reason for the collapse of the Christian community in the Maghrib because it led to the conversion *en masse* of Christians who, without bishops, had no legitimate place in the *dhimmi* system. Cf. M. de Epalza and E. Llobregat, “¿Hubo mozárabes en tierras valencianas?” p. 20, n. 23.

⁵ D. Wasserstein, *The Rise and Fall of the Party-Kings*, pp. 234-38.

⁶ See the beginning of chapter two above.

⁷ On this general cultural decline of the Mozarabs, especially regarding their cultivation of their Latin heritage, see M. Díaz y Díaz, “La vida literaria entre los mozárabes,” pp. 86-87, 99. For the earlier translations, see van Koningsveld,

To be fair, there were *some* signs of cultural life among eleventh-century Mozarabs: We do have a few extant scraps of Arabic poetry written by them in this period,⁸ and eleventh-century Mozarabs continued to recopy Latin works.⁹ But this is quite insignificant in comparison with what contemporary Andalusī Jews such as Samuel ibn Naghrīla (d. 1056) and Solomon ibn Gabirol (d. c. 1050) were accomplishing, even though the Jews almost certainly made up a considerably smaller percentage of the population than the Mozarabs.¹⁰ We should be wary, of course, of arguing from silence here, especially since so much of the Mozarabic legacy in Arabic from all periods has been lost to us because neither later medieval and early modern Spaniards nor North-African Muslims had much interest in preserving it.¹¹ But other kinds of evidence lead to the same conclusion. While a number of Jews—especially Ibn Naghrīla and his son—played important roles in Taifa politics as viziers and advisors, Wasserstein has shown that eleventh-century Mozarabs were “very inactive politically”: there are only two known instances of Mozarabs serving as Taifa viziers.¹²

“La literatura cristiano-árabe,” pp. 702-06; id., *The Latin-Arabic Glossary*, pp. 52-60. On the Orosius translation in general see H. Daiber, “Orosius’ *Historiae adversus paganos* in arabischer Überlieferung,” passim.

⁸ See van Koningsveld, “La literatura cristiano-árabe,” pp. 703-04; see also M.-Th. Urvoy, “La culture et la littérature arabe des chrétiens d’al-Andalus,” pp. 271-72.

⁹ See F. Simonet, *Historia de los mozárabes de España*, ch. 37, pp. 711-31; M. Díaz y Díaz, “Agustín entre los mozárabes,” passim; id., “La transmisión de los textos antiguos en la Península Ibérica,” pp. 147-58; and K. Reinhart, “Biblia y cultura en la época de la reconquista,” pp. 135-41 and passim. Simonet also argued that the famous Arabic translation of the *Collectio conciliorum* was made in the eleventh century (see *ibid.*, pp. 720-29, 808-12), and he has been followed in this dating by H. Kassis (see his “Muslim Revival in Spain in the Fifth/Eleventh Century,” p. 90, n. 40). P. van Koningsveld, however, has rightly challenged this dating, placing the translation in the tenth century (see his “La literatura cristiano-árabe,” pp. 704-06.)

¹⁰ See D. Wasserstein, *The Rise and Fall of the Party-Kings*, ch. 7, pp. 190-223, esp. 197-205, 222; on the size of the Mozarabic population in this period see chapter one above, p. 19, n. 26.

¹¹ See D. Urvoy, “La pensée religieuse des Mozarabes,” p. 419; and M.-Th. Urvoy, “La culture et la littérature arabe des chrétiens d’al-Andalus,” pp. 262-63.

¹² D. Wasserstein, *The Rise and Fall of the Party-Kings*, pp. 197-215, 224,

What the foregoing chapters suggest, however, is that while the Mozarabic community of the early eleventh century may well have been in marked cultural decline, just as the contemporary North-African Christian community apparently was, throughout the later eleventh and twelfth centuries a noticeable intellectual renewal was clearly underway. *Liber denudationis*, *Tathlith al-wahḍāntyah*, the fragments of Aghushtūn's *Maṣḥaf al-ʿālam al-kā'in*, and the other treatises and fragments studied here were all produced in the period from roughly 1050 to 1200 and together bear witness to an intellectual milieu of some vitality and creativity. Within this milieu, a largely anonymous group of educated Mozarabs were able to fruitfully make use of ideas and information drawn from the surprisingly large variety of Arabic and Latin books that circulated among them. In particular, the works of these Mozarabic apologists and polemicists make clear that their authors were still extensively involved in the three basic cultural and religious traditions which together constituted their peculiar religious and cultural identity.

In the first place, as Arabic-speaking Christians, the Mozarabs were heirs to a tradition of Arab Christianity which was hundreds of years old by the mid-eleventh century, and whose fruit was the large corpus of Arabic theological and apologetic works which circulated throughout the Islamic world. In their extensive familiarity with books representative of this Oriental Arab-Christian theological and apologetic tradition, the Mozarabic polemicists of this period show themselves to have claimed and assimilated this heritage. Professor Samir has observed that one result of the Arab-Muslim conquest of the Middle East was the gradual development of a necessary and practical ecumenism among the subject Christian sects—Melkites, Jacobites, Nestorians, and Copts—who differed among themselves in both ecclesiastical obedience and doctrine. Because of their eventual adoption of the Arabic language and the Arab culture of their masters, he writes,

232-34, 244-46; cf. C.-E. Dufourcq, "Le christianisme dans les pays de l'Occident musulman," p. 243; F. Simonet, *Historia de los mozárabes de España*, pp. 763, 769, n. 2.

An interconnecting circle (*ḥalqat al-ittiṣāl*) developed among all the Christians of the Orient. It united (*rabaṭat*) the Greeks, the Syrians, the Copts, and other sects, so that Christians began to make use of texts which were composed within other sects [than their own] regardless of doctrinal differences (*al-ikhṭilāf al-ʿaqaʿidī*).¹³

As their wide reliance on Oriental Arab-Christian writers such as the author of the *Apology of al-Kindī* indicates, the Mozarabs had become part of this same "interconnecting circle." Putting aside doctrinal differences, these Catholic, Latin Christians did not hesitate to put the texts of Nestorian and Melkite Christians of the Middle East to good use.¹⁴ This is hardly surprising: Mozarabs in many ways had more in common with Melkites in Palestine than they did with contemporary French Catholics.

But as the invocation of God after the Islamic fashion—*Bismillāh al-raḥmān al-raḥīm*—at the beginning of the epitaph of the twelfth-century Mozarab Michael Semeno indicates,¹⁵ the Mozarabs had not just become Arabic speakers; they had also gained an intimate knowledge of Islam as well, and even become, in the process, partially Islamicized. As such they were at home with the foundational religious literature of Islam as well. In coming to grips intellectually with Islam, therefore, they did not hesitate to open and study extensively the Qurʾān, the Ḥadīth, Qurʾānic commentaries, and other Islamic books. Though they used information from these sources in much the same way earlier

¹³ Kh. Samir, "al-Turāth al-ʿarabī al-masīhī," p. 26; cf. G. Marcuzzo, *Le dialogue d'Abraham de Tibériade*, p. 92.

¹⁴ In commenting on the ties of the Mozarabs with the Oriental Church, G. Levi della Vida has insisted that they seemed to have favored Nestorian writers since both the author of the *Apology* and Timothy were Nestorians. This Nestorian influence, according to Levi della Vida, may be what led to the development of specifically Spanish heresies such as Adoptionism. This is not the place to confirm or deny this observation, but it should be pointed out that, as I argued in chapter three above, the *Liber denudationis* appears to have relied in one place on a Palestinian-Melkite author. See G. Levi della Vida, "I Mozarabi," pp. 676-78; cf. on this matter also R. Collins, *Early Medieval Spain*, pp. 212-13; T. Glick, *Islamic and Christian Spain in the Early Middle Ages*, p. 288; D. Urvoy, "La pensée religieuse des Mozarabes," *passim*; and D. Millet-Gérard, *Chrétien mozarabes et culture islamique*, pp. 154-66.

¹⁵ See E. Lévi-Provençal, *Inscriptions arabes d'Espagne*, #81, p. 78; cf. the beginning of chapter one above.

Oriental Arab Christians had, they nevertheless knew them first-hand and understood—at least in considerable measure—the particular scholarly and religious conventions and principles which informed them.

Yet in addition to participating in the intellectual worlds of the Oriental Arab Christians and their Muslim rulers, the Mozarabs also partook in the concerns and insights of their contemporary Latin coreligionists. What their polemical writings tell us in this regard falls nicely in line with the conclusions of other scholars of the Mozarabic intellectual milieu. In his studies of Latin manuscripts annotated by twelfth-century Mozarabs, and of the contemporary *Glossarium latino-arabicum*, P. Sj. van Koningsveld has shown that the Mozarabs were demonstrating a remarkable interest in learning Latin and reading Latin books.¹⁶ Manuel Díaz y Díaz and Klaus Reinhardt have shown that after the reconquest of Toledo in 1085, Mozarabs both began once again to intensively cultivate their Visigothic-Latin heritage—especially the Visigothic liturgy—and adopted new Biblical-exegetical methods and tools introduced to Toledo by newly-arrived French clerics.¹⁷ When Aghshutīn and the author of *Tathlīth al-wahḍāntyah* transferred the Latin triad of the Frenchman Peter Abelard into kalāmīc Arabic and combined it with an Oriental Arab-Christian Trinitarian argument,¹⁸ they showed how thoroughly this renewed interest in Latin thought could be integrated with their own Arab culture.

Moreover, while the three categories of books that the Mozarabic apologists most obviously read were Oriental Arab-Christian theology, the foundational literature of Islam, and Latin-Christian theology, they were not the only ones. The *converso* author of *Tathlīth al-wahḍāntyah* was, at the very least, also familiar with the Hebrew and Aramaic Bible and probably had no small knowledge of other Jewish books as well. When the author of

¹⁶ See his *The Latin-Arabic Glossary*, passim.

¹⁷ See M. Díaz y Díaz, “La vida literaria entre los mozárabes,” pp. 99-100; id. “Breves notas sobres los mozárabes de Toledo,” passim, esp. pp. 23-24; K. Reinhardt, “Biblia y cultura en la época de la reconquista,” pp. 142-44, 151-52.

¹⁸ See chapter five above.

Liber denudationis refuted Muḥammad's miracle of the splitting of the moon, he quoted Aristotle on the size of that heavenly body and claimed that according to the principles of medieval cosmology the halves of a split moon would rather rise than fall.¹⁹ He thereby showed himself to be party to the considerable astronomical and scientific interest that was abroad in both the Arab and Latin worlds in this period.

The intellectual milieu from which these Mozarabic apologetic and polemical works emerged, therefore, was one of considerable vigor and modest creativity. At their best, Mozarabic apologists were able to appropriate, intermingle, and recast ideas and information borrowed from both Arab and Latin civilization, and from both the Muslim and Christian religious traditions. This was, then, a community which appears to have been developing precisely those sorts of intellectual resources which were absent among the North-African Christians who were so fully in decline by the late twelfth century. Particularly notable here is the creation and practice of a Christianized *Kalām* among the Mozarabs. In Mohamed Talbi's reckoning, North-African Jewry's energetic appropriation of kalāmic ideas and methods was essential to its survival under Islamic rule, and the failure of their Christian neighbors to do likewise was a crucial deficiency that contributed to the weakening of that community.²⁰ What North-African Christians were failing to do, however, Aghushtīn and the author of *Tathlīth al-waḥdānīyah* were quite clearly accomplishing. Having read works of both Muslim and Christian *Kalām*, these Mozarabic apologists were able to develop arguments for the Trinity and the possibility of incarnation which were formulated in terms drawn directly from the Arab-Muslim intellectual tradition.²¹

Yet we must not surrender to the temptation to see in all this much more than there is. Mozarabic intellectuals did know Oriental works by the likes of 'Ammār al-Baṣrī; they were at home with the Qur'ān and could find their way around a Ḥadīth collection or

¹⁹ See *Liber denudationis* 9.11-15.

²⁰ See M. Talbi, "Le Christianisme maghrébin," p. 331.

²¹ See chapter five above.

a Qur'ānic commentary; they were aware of some of what was going on in twelfth-century Latin-Christian theological circles. But we have no evidence here of any Mozarabic equivalents to the giants of contemporary Andalusī-Jewish or Andalusī-Muslim thought such as Moses Maimonides and Ibn Rushd; and there is no Mozarabic astronomer or philosopher or commentator on Aristotle whose works Latin-Christians were anxious to have translated. Ibn Rushd's brief references to the anonymous Christian *mutakallimūn* of his day reflect this situation quite accurately: while they provide valuable corroborating evidence of the practice of Christian *Kalām* in Spain, in their very terseness they indicate that it was a rather modest practice indeed. He mentioned no one by name, apparently not having come across any such Mozarabic *mutakallimūn* whose views were worthy of addressing at any length.²² While, therefore, the Mozarabic intellectual milieu may have been far from moribund by the twelfth century, and certainly far more advanced than that of the contemporary North-African Christians, nevertheless it was not creative or productive in the degree that eleventh- and the twelfth-century Andalusī-Jewish and Andalusī-Muslim cultures were.

What most clearly made the Mozarabic community in this period different from the contemporaneous North-African Christian community was, of course, the gradual integration of most of the former into the Christian Kingdom of Castile, and this development was doubtless an essential underpinning of their modest intellectual renewal. For in effect, by becoming subjects of Christian Castile, the Mozarabs became citizens of Latin Christendom just as it was beginning its great twelfth- and thirteenth-century flowering. The growth of cathedral schools, the Arabic-to-Latin translation movement, the renaissance of philosophical interest exemplified by Anselm and Peter Abelard, the quickening of missiological concern which led Peter the Venerable to hire Robert of Ketton and others to translate the Qur'ān and the *Apology of al-Kindī*—the Mozarabs newly under Christian rule would have come into contact with all these move-

²² See Ibn Rushd, *Tafīr mā ba'd al-ṭabī'āt*, book Lam, ch. 18, [exp. 1070a, 27-30], pp. 1498, 1503; and chapter five above, pp. 171-72.

ments so characteristic of the so-called Renaissance of the Twelfth Century.²³ Dramatically increased familiarity with Latin-Christian intellectuals would, of course, have been nearly unavoidable in reconquered Toledo, one of the most important centers of the contemporary Arabic-to-Latin translation movement and the home of many newly arrived Northern-European churchmen; and such connections between Mozarab and Latin Christian would have led naturally to the increased interest in the Latin language and Latin ideas which we have seen bear surprising fruit in *Tahtlith al-wahdāntiyah* and the fragments of Aghushtīn. Reyna Pastor de Togneri has argued that a small group of Mozarabs in and around Toledo managed to become fairly rich by the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries, becoming thereby part of the aristocracy of New Castile.²⁴ A smallish group of Mozarabic intellectuals appears to have found Latin-Christian rule equally stimulating on a cultural level.

The great irony here, of course, is that the very Latin-Christian stimulus which quickened the Mozarabic intellectual milieu eventually became the agent of its demise and disappearance. Having become subjects of the kings of Castile, the Mozarabs ceased to be a religious minority and became a linguistic and cultural minority. But while their devotion to Latin Catholicism provided them with sufficient incentive to maintain themselves as a distinct minority in al-Andalus, their fondness for the Arabic language and Arab custom was not deep enough to keep them from assimilating to the Latin-Christian society which now surrounded them. After about 1200, spoken Arabic began to die out among them, even though there were many Mozarab intellectuals such as Marc of Toledo who could still read and speak Arabic

²³ Here see C. H. Haskins' classic, *The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century*, passim, but for more recent works on the aspects of this renaissance mentioned here see D. Lindberg, "The Transmission of Greek and Arabic Learning to the West;" J. Kritzeck, *Peter the Venerable and Islam*; P. Dronke, ed. *A History of Twelfth-Century Western Philosophy*.

²⁴ R. Pastor de Togneri, "Problèmes d'assimilation d'une minorité: les Mozarabes de Tolède," pp. 368-69, 385-86. See also F. Hernández, "Language and Cultural Identity," p. 31.

extremely well;²⁵ after 1300, written Arabic in legal documents was replaced by Latin; by 1400 Mozarabs had ceased to be a distinct ethnic group altogether: the Mozarabs' immersion in Latin culture after the reconquest of Toledo slowly eroded their Arab cultural heritage.²⁶

*

Although the Mozarabic community did not survive beyond 1400 as a separate ethnic group, and its intellectual vitality was clearly played out long before that, the contributions of Mozarabic apologists managed to live on in the wider Latin-Christian intellectual milieu with considerable persistence. As Norman Daniel demonstrated three decades ago, the West is heavily indebted to the Mozarabs for its understanding of and approach to Islam; but, as he also indicated, their contribution to this understanding and approach to Islam has never been entirely clear: did Mozarabs simply pass on ideas formulated by Oriental Christians? did they make any contributions of their own?²⁷ We can be certain, after examining these Mozarabic sources, half of which were unavailable to Daniel,²⁸ that he was a little too harsh on the Mozarabs when he said that they were largely "silent and un-theological" when it came to anti-Islamic polemic, and that their contribution to the anti-Islamic polemical tradition is "unexpectedly small."²⁹ Though they clearly relied heavily on

²⁵ On Marc see M.-Th. d'Alverny, "Marc de Tolède," pp. 42-43.

²⁶ See F. Hernández, "Language and Cultural Identity," pp. 35, 40-44, and R. González, "Las minorías étnico-religiosas en la edad media española," HIE 2/2:503-05.

²⁷ See N. Daniel, *Islam and the West*, pp. 3, 12, 275.

²⁸ He relied widely on the *Liber denudationis* (which he called *Contrarietas alfolica*) and used Petrus' dialogue against the Saracens and the annotations of Robert of Ketton's translation of the Qur'ān, but in none of these cases did Daniel pay attention to their sources or their manner of composition (this, to be sure, would have been outside the concerns of his remarkable study); the other (Arabic) works studied here were either completely unavailable to him or simply not consulted.

²⁹ N. Daniel, *Islam and the West*, pp. 5, 12.

Oriental-Christian models, they contributed both their knowledge of Islamic tradition and their familiarity with Latin-Christian thought to their approach to Islam.

These contributions, moreover, are of more than anecdotal interest. For two important aspects of the Mozarabic polemical approach to Islam were taken over rather enthusiastically by the two greatest Latin missionary-apologists of the thirteenth century.

First of all, in their attempts to combine twelfth-century Latin-Christian thought with the methods and concerns of the *Kalām*, Aghushtīn and the author of *Tathlīth al-wahdāntyah*, anticipated the enormous undertaking of that energetic Spanish missionary Ramon Lull (1232-1316). Lull dedicated his whole life to converting Muslims and Jews, and in order to accomplish this task he developed an elaborate philosophical-apologetic system, which he called his *Art*, designed to convince unbelievers of the truth of the Latin church's teachings.³⁰ One of the most important characteristics of this system was that in developing it Lull sought, in the words of Charles Lohr, to appropriate "methods proper to Arabic tradition to convince the Muslims of the truth of Latin Christianity."³¹

Perhaps the feature of his apologetic approach that most clearly parallels Arab-Islamic thought is the conviction at the heart of Lull's apologetic system that knowledge of God could be gained through the contemplation and manipulation of His attributes, which Lull usually called God's "dignities" (*dignitates*).³² Now the origins of this key Lullian notion have been passionately debated for more than half a century, with some scholars, such as Asín-Palacios insisting that Lull's dignities were borrowed from Ibn 'Arabi's *ḥaḍarāt*, or names of God, while other scholars, such as the learned Ephrem Longpré, insisted that Lull took his "fundamental theory" regarding the dignities from theologians of the Augustinian school such as Anselm and Richard of St. Victor;

³⁰ For a concise discussion of the *Art* and its development see A. Bonner, *Selected Works of Ramon Lull* 1, pp. 58-70.

³¹ C. Lohr, "Christianus arabicus, cuius nomen Raimundus Lullus," p. 59.

³² See C. Lohr, "Christianus arabicus, cuius nomen Raimundus Lullus," pp. 61-62.

still others, such as Millás Vallicrosa, argued that the origins of the dignities lay in Hebrew Qabbalistic thought.³³ The nature and vigor of this debate on the origins of the dignities has tended, until recently, to obscure an essential point: that, given Lull's intention in designing the *Art*, probably all these theories are partially correct. Lull devised his theory of the dignities not on the basis of any one model developed by a representative of any one of the three religious traditions, but rather he quite knowingly constructed it in accordance with a general understanding of the nature of God's attributes which was more-or-less common to Jews, Christians, and Muslims alike. As we have seen,³⁴ Jewish, Christian, and Muslim thinkers throughout Christendom and the Islamic world were preoccupied with this same problem of the attributes of God, and drew on a common scriptural and philosophical tradition in their attempts to resolve it. By constructing his apologetic method on the basis of this common understanding of the divine attributes, Lull believed that it would be at once suitable to the Christian tradition and convincing to non-Christians.³⁵

This is obviously just what Aghushtīn and the author of *Tathlith al-wahdānīyah* had done on a more limited scale in the previous century,³⁶ for in their Trinitarian arguments these two Mozarabic apologists drew both upon Arabic views of the attributes, especially as they were propounded by the Muslim and

³³ M. Asín-Palacios, *Abenmasarra y su escuela . . . (apêndice 6: La teoría de las «ḥaḍras» de Ibn 'Arabī y las «dignitates» de Lulio)*, pp. 204-16 [for a related view see J. Tusquets, "Posicio de R. Lull en el problema del'eternitat del mon," pp. 105-07]; E. Longpré, "Lulle, Raymond (Le Bienheureux)," DTC 9.1, cols. 1113-14 [for similar views see also L. Eijo Garay, "Las dignidades lulianas," pp. 25-46, and H. Merle, "'Dignitas': signification philosophique et théologique," pp. 173-93]; J. Millás-Vallicrosa, "Algunas relaciones entre la doctrina luliana y la Cabala," pp. 241-53.

³⁴ See chapter five above.

³⁵ This view has been put forward in various ways by R. Pring-Mill, *El microcosmos Lullian*, 124-25; M. Cruz Hernández, *El pensamiento de Ramon Llull*, pp. 72-79; C. Lohr, "Christianus arabicus, cuius nomen Raimundus Lullus," pp. 61-62; A. Bonner, *Selected Works of Ramon Llull* 1, pp. 59-61; M. Johnston, *The Spiritual Logic of Ramon Llull*, p. 19.

³⁶ See chapter five above.

non-Muslim *mutakallimūn*, and upon contemporary Latin-Christian Trinitarian ideas intimately related to the Latin theories of the divine attributes. They did this because—like Lull at a later date—they realised that this common debate about God's attributes provided them with a common conceptual framework within which to develop Christian apologetic.

Lull came up with something very different from the two Mozarabic Trinitarian arguments when he combined various Christian, Muslim, and Jewish ideas about the divine attributes. His *Art* is far more complex and immeasurably more comprehensive in scope than the rather simple attempts of Aghushtīn and the author of *Tathlith al-wahdāntyah* to reduce the divine attributes to three, and identify these with the persons of the Trinity. Indeed, Lull conceived of his *Art*—and attempted to use it—as a method for demonstrating all manner of truths, from the religious to the scientific.³⁷ One cannot, however, help noticing that at their core, both the Mozarabic Trinitarian arguments and Lull's whole apologetic *Art* are attempts to demonstrate the truth of Christian doctrine, not by referring to the authority of scripture, but rather by arguing on the basis of general assumptions about the attributes of God that partisans of all three western religions held in common. Their argumentative strategy, in short, was exactly the same: to argue, as Lull put it, “not against faith, but by means of faith.”³⁸

It is quite possible, therefore, that Aghustīn's *Maṣḥaf al-ʿālam al-kā'in* and the anonymous *Tathlith al-wahdāntyah*—both of which were still circulating in Spain near the time of Lull's birth in 1232³⁹—exercised an important influence on Lull in his formulation of the *Art*; for while there are many Jewish, Christian, and Muslim discussions of the divine attributes that show parallels with Lull's views, only these Mozarabic treatises actually use the

³⁷ See A. Bonner, *Selected Works of Ramon Lull* 1, p. 66.

³⁸ “Et ideo ego, qui sum verus Catholicus, non intendo probare Articulos contra Fidem, sed mediante Fide” (Ramon Lull, *Liber de convenientia fidei et intellectus in objecto*, p. 572; cf. E. Longpré, “Lulle, Raymond [Le Bien-heureux],” DTC 9/1, cols. 1123-25).

³⁹ See P. van Koningsveld, “La apología de al-Kindī,” 110-11, note 5.

common discussion of the divine attributes for the same *purposes* as Lull does—Christian apologetic directed at Muslims and Jews. We do not find this in Augustine or Anselm or Abelard or the Victorines;⁴⁰ and we manifestly could never find such a procedure in Ibn ‘Arabī or the Qabbalistic tradition. Moreover, while I know of no direct evidence indicating that Lull knew of Aghushtīn’s writings or *Tathlith al-wahdāntyah*, it is clear that he knew of and was probably influenced in various ways by both the *Apology of al-Kindī*, which was well-known to the Mozarabs, and *Liber denudationis*⁴¹ which originated among them. He furthermore held certain unnamed “Arab Christians” in very high regard, asserting that they were particularly skillful in disputation with Muslims.⁴² It is not at all hard to imagine that Aghushtīn and the author of *Tathlith al-wahdāntyah* were among these “Arab Christians” whom Lull so admired.

The legacy of the Mozarabic approach to Islam lived on in a second way in the anti-Islamic writings of Ramon Lull’s great intellectual rival, the Dominican Ramon Martí (d. c. 1290). Lull appears to have genuinely disliked Martí, his extraordinarily learned compatriot and fellow missionary, and much of this disaffection stemmed from very real differences in their respective approaches to evangelization.⁴³ These differences can be traced to the fact that Lull’s whole system was an elaborately developed version of the central idea of the Trinitarian arguments of Aghushtīn and the author of *Tathlith al-wahdāntyah*: to combine compatible Latin-Christian and Arab-Muslim approaches to theology and piety into an apologetic method both acceptable to the former and convincing to the latter. Much of Martí’s approach to

⁴⁰ Though Peter Abelard did believe that some of his ideas relating to the attributes and to the Trinity might be useful in this way; see above chapter five, pp. 187-88.

⁴¹ See C. Lohr, “Ramon Llull, Liber Alquindi and Liber Telif,” *passim*; and T. Burman, “The Influence of the *Apology of al-Kindī*,” *passim*.

⁴² See Lull’s *De fine* 1. 2, *Raimundi Lulli opera latina* 9, CCCM 35, p. 256, ll. 180-81; cf. C. Lohr, “Christianus arabicus, cuius nomen Raimundus Lullus,” p. 60; and T. Burman, “The Influence of the *Apology of al-Kindī*,” pp. 200-201.

⁴³ A useful overview of this whole question can be found in E. Colomer Pou’s article, “Ramon Llull y Ramon Martí,” *passim*.

evangelizing, on the other hand, is a development and extension of another aspect of the earlier Mozarabic approach to anti-Islamic polemic: the use of Islamic tradition itself against Muslims. This is particularly clear in the *Quadruplex reprobatio*, which H. I. Delgado has convincingly shown to be a work of Martí, something long suspected.⁴⁴ In this work Martí, like the author of *Liber denudationis*, paraphrases or quotes many Islamic traditions drawn from a variety of sources in order to expose what he sees as the licentiousness and inauthenticity of the Prophet and his religion.

Moreover, good scholastic that he was,⁴⁵ Martí always carefully points out where he has found the Traditional material that he uses, as the *Quadruplex reprobatio* makes clear on nearly every page. Like earlier Mozarabic polemicists, he relies heavily on the main Ḥadīth collections. "Likewise in the book which is called *Bohari*," he writes at one point, "[Muḥammad] says while speaking about a fly, 'When a fly falls in a vessel, submerge it there because it carries poison on [one] wing, and on the other wing medicine.'"⁴⁶ "The book which is called *Bohari*" is, of course, the *Ṣaḥīḥ* of al-Bukhārī, and this Latin account of Muḥammad's directions concerning the fly translates quite closely a short ḥadīth preserved by al-Bukhārī.⁴⁷ Usually Martí tells us not only which Ḥadīth collection he is using, but also what section of that collection each tradition comes from. When he criticizes the Islamic

⁴⁴ See H. Delgado "Le 'Seta Machometi' du Cod. 46 d'Osma," *passim*; cf. N. Daniel, *Islam and the West*, p. 13.

⁴⁵ On his life and education, see J. Cohen, *The Friars and the Jews*, p. 129-30; the older article by A. Berthier, "Un Maître orientaliste du XIIIe siècle," *passim*, is still very useful.

⁴⁶ "Item in libro qui dicitur Bohari loquens de musca ait, 'Quando cecidit musca in vas submerge eam ibi quia in sua ala portat venenum et in alia medicinam' (*Quadruplex reprobatio*, fol. 153ra, ll. 2-6)." N. b. that Martí, like the translators of *Liber denudationis*, had difficulty translating the tenses of Arabic verbs (see introduction to part II below). Though it makes no sense in Latin he has rendered the Arabic *waqa'a* (see next note), here meaning "[the fly] falls," with the Latin perfect *cecidit*, meaning "[the fly] fell," because the Arabic verb is grammatically in the perfect tense, though in this conditional sentence it is not understood to have any past meaning.

⁴⁷ "Idhā waqa'a al-dhubbāb fī sharāb aḥadikum fal-yaghmis-hu fa-inna fī aḥad janāḥayhi dā' wa-fī al-ākhar al-shifā'" (al-Bukhārī 59. 17. 1).

view of predestination, for example, he notes that “[Muḥammad] said in the book which is called *Bohari* in the Chapter of Predestination” that God writes out for each man his role in life and does not allow him to depart from it.⁴⁸ Turning to al-Bukhārī’s *Ṣaḥīḥ*, we find that the same tradition is indeed recorded in the section entitled “The Book of Predestination” (*Kitāb al-qadar*).⁴⁹ Martí uses the Ḥadīth collections of both al-Bukhārī and Muslim in similar fashion and with equal frequency. His borrowings from Ibn Iṣḥāq’s *Ṣīrah*, or biography, of the Prophet are fewer, though again he is both accurate and specific in his references to this work. When recounting the genealogy of the Prophet preserved in that biography, Martí writes “just as it is held [to be the case] in a book which is called *Ciar*,⁵⁰ that is, *The Acts of Muḥammad*: Muḥammad was from the stock of Ishmael the son of Abraham, and his father was called Abdala son of Abdamutalib. . .”⁵¹

Moreover, like the Annotator of the first Latin translation of the Qur’ān and the author of *Liber denudationis*, the learned Dominican also consulted Qur’ānic commentaries as he wrote, for when Martí refutes the miracle of the splitting of the moon he mentions the views of an unnamed *glosator Alchorani* (“glossator of the Qur’ān”) on verse 54:1, as also when he describes the marriage of Muḥammad to Zaynab.⁵² While exposing what he sees as the loose morals of Islam he observes in good polemical fashion that

[Muḥammad] says in the Qur’ān in the Tractate of the Cow, *Your women are your ploughed land. Therefore enter your ploughed land in any way you want* (2.223). But the gloss of the Muslims says: ‘*in any way, that is, forwards or backwards.*’⁵³

⁴⁸ “Item dixit in libro qui dicitur Bohari in Capitulo Predestinacionis . . .” (*Quadruplex reprobatio*, fol. 152rb, ll. 27-28).

⁴⁹ al-Bukhārī 82. 15. 1.

⁵⁰ Probably this was *Cira* in earlier mss.

⁵¹ “Sicut habetur in libro qui dicitur Ciar, id est, Actus Mahometi: Mahometus fuit de genere Ismahel filii Abrahe, et pater eius vocabatur Abdalla filius A[b]damutalib . . .” (*Quadruplex reprobatio*, fols. 157vb, l. 35 - 158ra, l. 3; cf. Ibn Iṣḥāq, pp. 97-109).

⁵² See *Quadruplex reprobatio*, fols. 153ra, l. 28ff., 154ra-b.

⁵³ “Dicit in Alchorano in Tractatu Vacce, *Mulieres vestre sunt aracio vestra. Ergo intrate aracionem vestram quocumque modo volueritis. Sed dicit glosa saracenorum: quocumque modo*, id est, ante et retro” (*Quadruplex reprobatio*,

The explanation attributed to the Muslims here follows very closely the explanations of this verse proposed by the Qur'ānic commentators. Ibn Kathīr, for example, glosses the last part of the verse as follows: "*So come to your tilth however you want*, that is, however you want, forwards or backwards."⁵⁴

The mining of Islamic Tradition for good ammunition to use against Muslims was an approach to apologetic and evangelization that Lull did not use at all, while Martí shunned Lull's approach.⁵⁵ In this case, moreover, we have direct evidence linking Martí to the earlier Mozarabic apologists. As I argued in chapter two above, Martí had clearly read *Liber denudationis*, probably in the original Arabic version as his quotations from it in his *Explanatio simboli apostolorum* indicate.⁵⁶ Moreover, as I have noted in the commentary to *Liber denudationis*, there are many parallels between this work and the *Quadruplex reprobatio*,⁵⁷ indicating that, in either its Arabic or Latin form, it was also an important source for *Quadruplex reprobatio*. The rebuttals of the miracle of the splitting of the moon in both *Liber denudationis* and *Quadruplex reprobatio* are particularly similar, for example. Both apologists mention the Qur'ānic and Traditional evidence for this event, and both cite Qur'ānic commentaries in the course of this. In both works astronomical theories are used to show that there is no way that the two halves of the moon could have been held on

fol. 154va, ll. 17-22). The Latin translation of the Qur'ānic Arabic is quite accurate.

⁵⁴ "*Fa-atū ḥarthakum annā shi'tum* ay kayfa shi'tum muqbilatan wa-mudbiratan" (Ibn Kathīr on 2:223; 1, p. 390; cf. al-Ṭabarī on 2:223; 2, 392ff).

⁵⁵ Lull did mention the Ḥadīth once in the *Book of the Gentile* 4. 12 (see C. Lohr, "Christianus arabicus, cuius nomen Raimundus Lullus," p. 61, n. 15); but his general lack of interest in Islamic Tradition is an eloquent testament to his overwhelmingly rationalist approach to apologetic and polemic. Martí, on the other hand, did resort to rationalist apologetic on occasion (see especially his Trinitarian argumentation in the Abelardian tradition discussed in chapter five above in his *Explanatio simboli apostolorum* pp. 460, l. 43 - 461, l. 36), but in no instance did he opt for an approach in any way reminiscent of Lull's *Art*.

⁵⁶ See chapter two, pp. 47-49, 56-59.

⁵⁷ See commentary to *Liber denudationis* 2.1, 3.3, 4.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.11, 9.12, 10.1, 10.2.

two mountains, because the great size of the moon would have made this impossible.⁵⁸ *Liber denudationis*' handling of this problem, therefore, looks very much like the model for that of the *Quadruplex reprobatio*. Furthermore, Martí is only the most prominent Dominican continuator of the Mozarabic use of Islamic Tradition against Muslims, for his younger confrère Riccoldo da Monte di Croce (d. early thirteen century) had read *Liber denudationis* closely and quoted from it extensively in his *Contra legem sarracenorum* and to a lesser extent in his *Itinerarium*, and thereby adopted the Mozarabic use of Islamic Tradition with particular zeal.⁵⁹

Moreover, this continued use of Islamic Tradition against Muslims in the thirteenth century must be connected in some way with one of the most important developments in medieval Christian attitudes toward Jews. As Jeremy Cohen and Robert Chazan have shown, thirteenth-century friars devised an "innovative argumentation" (Chazan's phrase) which they used polemically against Jews alongside the older time-honored evangelizing techniques. This new approach consisted of assiduously studying Jewish Tradition as it existed in the Talmud, Biblical exegesis, and other sources, and then using this extra-Biblical material against Jews in religious disputation.⁶⁰ Yet while this was a considerable innovation in the relations between European Christians and Jews, from one point of view this kind of argumentation was not new at all. It was merely the transference to anti-Jewish polemic of one of the key Mozarabic (and earlier Oriental-Christian) approaches to Islam. As *Liber denudationis*, the Annotator's Latin commentary on Robert of Ketton's translation of the Qur'ān, and the other works studied here make abundantly clear, Mozarabs were using Islamic Tradition against Muslims long before thirteenth-century friars began using Jewish Tradition against Jews. Moreover, one

⁵⁸ See *Liber denudationis* 9.11-12, 9.15 (cf. chapter four above), and *Quadruplex reprobatio*, fol. 154ra-b.

⁵⁹ See J.-M. Mériçoux, "L'ouvrage d'un frère prêcheur," pp. 31-32, M.-Th. d'Alverny, "Marc de Tolède," p. 48, the introduction to my edition of *Liber denudationis* below, and the appendix to this study.

⁶⁰ See J. Cohen, *The Friars and the Jews*, passim, esp. pp. 51-195, and R. Chazan, *Daggers of Faith*, passim, esp. pp. 49-85, 115-36.

of the apologists who was most responsible for devising this new anti-Jewish strategy was none other than the learned Dominican Ramon Martí himself—indeed, his *magnum opus* called *Pugio fidei* (*The Dagger of Faith*) is the best and most substantial example of this innovative anti-Jewish argumentation.⁶¹ The *Pugio fidei* and Martí's other works against the Jews were written in the latter part of his career, his earlier works, such as the *Quadruplex reprobatio* having been concerned largely with Muslims. In his case, therefore, the use of Islamic Tradition against Muslims was clearly the forerunner of the use of Jewish Tradition against Jews. Martí's familiarity with that far older anti-Islamic approach must surely have been part of what inspired him to develop this new anti-Jewish approach.

*

In the early twelfth century Mozarabs were still, as Orderic Vitalis observed, commonly reared among Muslims, even though they embraced the Christian religion.⁶² But by the time Lull and Martí were adopting and adapting Mozarabic approaches to apologetic and polemic in the later thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, the Mozarabs had long since ceased to be raised in a thoroughly Islamic milieu and had already probably ceased to speak Arabic. Though they continued to embrace the Christian religion, they were now reared in a society which, though still highly pluralistic, was dominated by the Latin culture of the rest of western Europe. It therefore was inevitably left to these two missionary Orientalists and others like them—Latin Christians who, by learning Arabic and immersing themselves in Arab civilization, had become, in Mikel de Epalza's terminology, the thirteenth century's Neo-Mozarabs⁶³—to perpetuate the cultural legacy of the eleventh- and

⁶¹ See J. Cohen, *The Friars and the Jews*, pp. 129-69, and Chazan, *Daggers of Faith*, pp. 115-36.

⁶² Orderic Vitalis, *Historia ecclesiastica* 13.6, vol. 6, pp. 404-06; cf. the Introduction to this study above.

⁶³ See the Introduction to this study above.

twelfth-century Mozarabs who lived largely in and around Toledo. The works of Lull and Martí not only were crucially influenced by the works of Mozarabs, such as the authors of *Tathlith al-wahdāntyah* and *Liber denudationis*; but they also eloquently testify to the continued circulation among thirteenth-century missionaries of precisely the same kinds of Arabic and Latin books which traveled in earlier Mozarabic circles—treatises by Oriental Arab Christians, the Qurʾān and Islamic books containing the Ḥadīth (as well as a variety of other Arabic books), and, of course, Latin theology.⁶⁴ The cultural legacy of the eleventh- and twelfth-century Mozarabs, therefore, lived on in these Latin-Christian missionaries' reliance both on the books that those Mozarabs wrote and the books that those Mozarabs read as they wrote.

The *converso*-Mozarabic author of *Tathlith al-wahdāntyah* observed at one point, in a curiously self-conscious aside, that

Everyone plunges (*yaqtahimu*) into [religious] disputation even if they do not do it well; and they see it as a religious duty (*fartdah*) even when they do not understand it, even when they have not learned any part of the sciences (*ʿulām*) and the arts (*ṣināʿat*) except what is superfluous (*al-fudūl*).⁶⁵

This urge to “plunge” into religious controversy, whether one was prepared for it or not, was doubtless the result of the intellectual renewal which developed among the Mozarabs in the midst of, and perhaps because of, the extraordinary changes their community was experiencing. But by inspiring eleventh- and twelfth-century Mozarabs to compose such works as *Tathlith al-wahdāntyah*, this same urge to engage in religious disputation ensured that some evidence of that intellectual renewal and its connection with European intellectual history was preserved for later ages. For this small corpus of Arabic and Latin religious-controversial works not only indicates that the Mozarabic intellectual milieu between 1050 and 1200 was surprisingly lively,

⁶⁴ For more on Lull in this connection see T. Burman, “The Influence of the *Apology of al-Kindī*,” passim; for more on the Arabic sources of Martí see A. Cortabarría Beitia, “Fuentes árabes del *Pugio fidei*,” passim, and id., “La connaissance des textes arabes chez Raymond Martin O. P.,” passim.

⁶⁵ *Tathlith al-wahdāntyah* in al-Qurṭubī, p. 164.

but it also allows us to see that the approaches to Islam of the greatest missionaries of the High Middle Ages were vitally informed by ideas and methods drawn directly from Mozarabic apologists of that same crucial period.

PART TWO

AN EDITION AND TRANSLATION
OF *LIBER DENUDATIONIS SIUE OSTENSIONIS*
AUT PATEFACIENS

INTRODUCTION

In addition to being an extremely valuable source for the intellectual history of the Mozarabs in the period from 1050 to 1200, the anonymous *Liber denudationis siue ostensionis aut patefaciens* is also probably the most important extant literary work of any kind produced by those Arabic-speaking Christians, even though it exists, so far as we know, only in this apparently abbreviated Latin translation. Moreover, it exercised considerable though largely indirect influence on the way in which later Europeans thought about Islam.¹ There is no doubt, therefore, that it deserves to be edited and translated.

Given this treatise's considerable importance, however, it may seem surprising that it exists in only one late (sixteenth-century) manuscript whose reliability has been questioned more than once.² None of the other scholars who have used the work extensively—M.-Th. d'Alverny, N. Daniel, and J. Mérigoux—has ever found another manuscript. Though I have made extensive inquiries, I also have failed to find another witness to the text.³ It is particu-

¹ See N. Daniel, *Islam and the West*, pp. 6, 35, 65, 76, and 172.

² See M.-Th. d'Alverny, "Deux traductions," p. 126, and C. Lohr, "Ramon Llull, *Liber Alquindi*," p. 158.

³ No other mss. of the work are listed in any of the major incipit or explicit files (such as those of the Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes in Paris and the Hill Monastic Library in Minnesota). Furthermore, I have examined the majority of catalogues, printed or unprinted, of Spanish, French, and Italian manuscript collections, and have looked at scores of other catalogues of collections elsewhere in Europe, and likewise have found not a single trace of a further manuscript. Finally, Professor F. Edward Cranz (whose two other invaluable microfilmed research aids—his *A Microfilm Corpus of the Indexes to Printed Catalogues of Latin Manuscripts before 1600 A.D.* [New London, Conn., 1982], and his *A Microfilm Corpus of Unpublished Inventories of Latin Manuscripts through 1600 A.D.* [New London, Conn., 1988]—made it immeasurably easier to search the catalogues just described) also graciously allowed me to examine the typescript of his forthcoming *A Microfilm Index to the Unindexed Printed Lists of Latin Manuscripts through 1600 A. D.* This work is an index to another nearly five hundred unindexed, printed catalogues of Latin manuscripts, and it too contains no trace of another manuscript of *Liber denudationis*.

larly notable that Riccoldo da Monte di Croce's late thirteenth-century *Contra legem Sarracenorum*, which relies heavily on *Liber denudationis* and quotes extensively from it, is extant in at least 28 manuscripts, and was so highly regarded that it was eventually translated into Greek and then back into Latin.⁴ Why was the work which was so heavily derivative of *Liber denudationis* so popular, when *Liber denudationis* itself was manifestly not?

The only answers that can be given to this conundrum are, of course, speculative. But one probable reason suggests itself in nearly every paragraph of the work: quite simply, the translation of *Liber denudationis* was just too awkwardly made, the resulting Latin prose too often stilted or inscrutable to make *Liber denudationis* the sort of work that many people would have wanted to read. As I have already pointed out, the translators of this work, like most other medieval Latin translators, felt obligated to translate word for word.⁵ Unfortunately, in *Liber denudationis* the problems of peculiar sentence structure and unusual word choice which are the typical results of this widespread word-for-word approach to translation were compounded by many instances of misleading sloppiness.⁶ It is not surprising that the only medieval scholars whom we know or suspect to have read *Liber denudationis* in the two hundred years after it was written were all Arabists themselves (Ramon Lull, Ramon Martí, Riccoldo da Monte di Croce) and at least one of them (Martí) almost surely read it in Arabic.⁷ This suggests that the only medieval Latin Christians who could read this work profitably were those whose knowledge of Arabic allowed them to read it in the Arabic original or helped them to understand the problematic Latin with its many Arabisms. Only when Riccoldo had digested it and paraphrased or quoted many passages from it in his own apologetic work, did its influence become widespread.

⁴ See J.-M. Mérioux, "L'ouvrage d'un frère prêcheur," pp. 31-32, 51-55.

⁵ See chapter two above, pp. 57-61.

⁶ As I will show below.

⁷ See chapters two and six above, pp. 46-49, 56-59, 207.

Whether or not the awkwardness of the Latin translation explains the work's lack of direct medieval popularity, this awkwardness, together with the lateness of the one known manuscript, do present real problems for the modern editor and translator of *Liber denudationis*. Since I have discussed the date, authorship, translators, title, sources, and significance of *Liber denudationis* in chapter two, this introduction to the edition and English translation will be concerned primarily with the problems arising from this awkwardness of the Latin translation and the lateness of the only known manuscript. After describing the manuscript,⁸ therefore, I will discuss its extensive marginal annotations and their relationship to the text, address the problem of the manuscript's reliability, and set forth my editorial and translating principles and conventions.

*

Manuscript Description:

Title: Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 3394: Alcoran, interprete Marco Toletano—Contrarietas Alpholica; Italy, *saec.* XVI, Latin (fols. 1-266) and *saec.* XVII, French, (fols. 270-338).

Physical Description: Fols. 1-269: Paper 315 x 220 mm. Quires of 12 fols., designated by letters of the alphabet from A to Y in the bottom right corner of the first folio of each, except for quires F (10 fols.), and L (14 fols.). 21 long lines faintly ruled in crayon. Left and right margins likewise ruled in crayon. Written in a humanistic cursive hand⁹ originating "without doubt," note M.-Th. d'Alverny and Vajda, in Italy near the end of the 16th century.¹⁰ Extensive marginal annotations in a 17th century hand

⁸ The manuscript description and description of contents which follow, except where noted, are based on my own examination of the ms. and the description of it in *Bibliothèque Nationale. Catalogue général des manuscrits latins* vol. 5 (Paris, 1966), pp. 339-341.

⁹ I use here the nomenclature developed by G. Battelli in his "Nomenclature des écritures humanistiques," in B. Bischoff, *Nomenclature des écritures livresques du ix^e au xv^e siècle*, see esp. pp. 35-44 and figs. 38-40.

¹⁰ M.-Th. d'Alverny and G. Vajda, "Marc de Tolède, traducteur," p. 127.

are found on fols. 1-33, 92-99, 109-113, 133-136, 233-267; sporadic annotations by the same hand (some in pencil) are found elsewhere; fols. 2, 5, 7 bis, 11, 13, and 238 are small inserted leaves of varying sizes containing such annotations. Written space 225 x 160 mm (up to 250 x 188 mm with annotations). Punctuation: Comma and semi-colon used for natural pauses; colon to introduce reported speech; *punctus* for indicating the end of a train of thought; in those pages having annotations much of the punctuation has been modified or supplemented by the annotator.

Fols. 270-338: Paper, fols. 270-316: 310 x 215 mm; fols. 317-326: 315 x 215 mm; fols. 327-338: 310 x 210 mm. Quires of 12, 10, 15, 10, and 11 fols. numbered 1-5 respectively at the bottom right corner of the first folio of each. 25-27 long lines in one column. 17th-century hand with some corrections by a contemporaneous hand. Punctuation: comma, colon, semi-colon, and *punctus* all used in more-or-less modern fashion; accents used only rarely.

Binding: parchment binding over cardboard. Previous shelf marks recorded on fol. 1r: "Codex Colber<t> 913" and "Regius 4895a" (top margin) together with a "Biblioteca Regia" seal and its current B.N. number, "3394" (bottom margin).

Contents: 1] (fols. 1-237r) Marc of Toledo, translator, *Alchoranus Machometi*. "In nomine Dei misericordis miseratoris. Hic est liber Alchorani Machometi, quem Marcus canonicus Toletanus de arabica lingua transtulit in latinam. Materia libri septem periodi. In nomine Dei misericordis, miseratoris. Gloria Deo creatori gentium, misericordi miseratori qui regnat in die legis. . . / . . . In nomine Dei misericordis miseratoris, amen. Dic, defendo me cum creatore hominum, rege hominum, Deo hominum, de malo susurronis occulti qui susurrat in pectoribus hominum, et de daemonibus et hominibus. Explicit liber Alchorani Machometi. Laus Deo A. V. F."¹¹

2] (fols. 237v-263v) Anon., *Liber denudationis siue ostensionis aut patefaciens* (alias *Contrarietas alfolica*). "Il-Fulika (in Arabic

¹¹ This translation is still unpublished. Bibliography: M.-Th. d'Alverny, "Deux traductions," pp. 113-120; Id. "Quelques manuscrits de la «Collectio Toletana»,» p. 216.

characters carefully vocalized in the peculiar manner which I have indicated) ELFOLICA siue ALPHOLICHA, hoc est Alcorani ac Mahometanae legis ab ipsis orientalibus confutatio seu perfectorum in leges praecepta. Caput unum. (The previous title added by the seventeenth-century annotator.¹²) In nomine Patris, Patris seculorum, et Filii, Filii resurrectionum, et Spiritus Sancti, uiuificatoris eorum qui sunt in sepulchris, Vnitatis in Trinitate, Trinitatis in Unitate, qua creauit nos de terra, et transtulit nos in generationes et lumbos. . . / . . . Longe autem plures fuerunt quos consumpsit gladius quam illi qui gratis eum secuti sunt. Explicit benedictus Deus. Interpretem qui uerbum de uerbo transtulerat sum secutus sensus potius quam uerba tenendo et multa breuiando.”¹³

3] (fols. 263v-266v, wrongly identified as chapter 13 of previous work) An abbreviated version of chapter 5 of Petrus Alfonsi's *Dialogi in quibus impiae Iudaeorum confutantur* (i.e. that part of the *Dialogi* in which Petrus attacks Islam). “Tertium decimum capitulum quod praemissis contra Machometum attestat Petrus Anfulsus, primum iudaeus philosophus factus postmodum Christianus. Petrus autem Anfulsus iudaeus philosophus. . . in libro tertio de fide capitulo nono qui totus est de Sarracenismo, sic ait, per modum dialogi loquens. . . / . . . Machometum omnes deprehendissent, omnes a lege eius discedere uoluerunt cum

¹² Fol. 238 is a leaf about half the size of the other fols. inserted later by the annotator with another version of this title of the work: “PATEFACIENS, siue DENUDATIONIS ET OSTENSIONIS LIBELLUS, IN QUO Patefacta aduersus contrariantes Fidei Christianae, eorum infidelitas & deviatio à recto tramite: telis contra illos ab ipso Alcorano depromptis. Hoc est, CONTRARIETAS ALPHOLICA; seu Perfectorum in Lege Mahometi contrariantes inter se opiniones detectae & impugnatae. De Authoris huius Libelli à Mahometismo defectione, ad Fidem Christianam conuersione, & operis inscriptione. CAPITULUM I. IN NOMINE”

¹³ Bibliography: M.-Th. d'Alverny, “Deux traductions,” pp. 125-27; Id., “La connaissance” pp. 591-92; Id., “Marc de Tolède,” pp. 43-48; M.-Th. d'Alverny and Vajda, “Marc de Tolède, traducteur,” pp. 124-32; E. Cerulli, *Il “Libro della Scala”*, p. 354; N. Daniel, *Islam and the West*, pp. 6, 35, 51, 64-66, 76, 172, 239, 278, see also index under *Contrarietas elfolica*; C. Lohr, “Ramon Llull, Liber Alquindi,” pp. 145-60; T. Burman, “The Influence of the *Apology of Al-Kindi* and *Contrarietas alfolica* on Ramon Lull's Late Religious Polemic, 1305-1313,” *passim*.

decem sotiis eius et factus eius successor callide retinens populum; dixit non eum dixisse Machometum debere assumi ad caelum, sed iam humatum de sepulcro transferri (sic)."¹⁴ (fols. 267r-269v blank)

5] (fols. 270r-338r) French translation of the first four sūrahs of the Qur'ān following the corrected version of Marc of Toledo above. fols. 270r-290v: sūrahs one and two: "Chapitre premier. Au nom de Dieu clement et misericordieux. Louange soit a Dieu seigneur du monde, clement et misericordieux, Roy du jour du jugement. . . / . . . ne nous charge pas de ce que nous n'auons la force de supporter. Fais nous grace; pardonne nous, et nous fais misericorde. Tu es nostre seigneur; donne nous victoire contre les personnes hereticques." (fols. 291r-292v blank) fols. 293-315 under the title "Oraison journaliere des Mahometans", a second, identical copy of above two sūrahs. fols. 317r-338r: sūrahs three and four: "Chapitre III. De la lignee e Joachim. Dieu, il n'y a point de Dieu que luy, vivant et eternel. Na faiet descendre sur luy le liure avec verité confirmant ce qui. . . / . . . Que s'ils sont plusieurs freres, et plusieurs seurs, plusieurs masles et femelles, les masles aurone la part de deux femelles. Dieu vous enseigne (ses preceptes) a fin que vous desuoyer, car Dieu scait tout."¹⁵

*

The seventeenth-century annotator: What strikes one most upon opening B. N. lat. 3394 are the enormous number of marginal and interlinear annotations appearing in large portions of the first 267 folios,¹⁶ including all of the text of the *Liber denudationis* wherein words have been changed, sentences recast, and explanatory notes

¹⁴ Edited in PL 157:597-606. Bibliography: N. Daniel, *Islam and the West*, pp. 7, 68, 84, 217-219, 311-12; M.-Th. d'Alverny, "La connaissance," pp. 593-595; B. Kedar, *Crusade and Mission*, p. 92; J. Tolan, *Petrus Alfonsi*, passim.

¹⁵ This translation remains unpublished.

¹⁶ For all practical purposes fols. 270-338—written in French, in a different hand, on different paper, and without these extensive glosses—can be considered a separate manuscript, bound to fols. 1-269 because of similarity of content. In the following discussion of the annotator, these latter folios play no part.

added. Since we have only one manuscript of *Liber denudationis*, these seventeenth-century annotations must be considered in some detail because it is possible that they might shed some useful light on the text of this work were they made with the assistance of another manuscript.

There is no way to know who made these annotations, and it is not entirely clear whether they were made by one seventeenth-century scholar or more than one. The cataloguer of the manuscript at the Bibliothèque Nationale, for example, asserted that while the annotations on the Qur'ān in the first part of the manuscript were made by one hand, those on the text of the *Liber denudationis* were made by two hands.¹⁷ It seems quite likely to me, on the contrary, that the great bulk of the annotations to the text of *Liber denudationis* were made by only one scholar, even though some of the annotations are in a hasty, cursive hand, while the rest are in a rather careful non-cursive hand. Though these two hands seem quite different, there are several notes that begin in the non-cursive hand only to shift to the cursive hand midway through (see, e. g., fol. 23r between ll. 14-15: *et ponam eos qui sequuti sunt te, super eos qui blasphemarunt usque . . .*). What look like the hands of two different annotators are very likely simply the cursive and non-cursive hands of the same early-modern Orientalist.¹⁸

Whoever the author or authors of these notes were, they do seem to have possessed a rather extensive knowledge of Arabic and some knowledge of Islam. Arabic words appear occasionally in the notes (e.g. fols. 4v rm c. ll. 5-6; fol. 25r, lm c. ll. 3-4). One marginal note on the translation of the Qur'ān even explains that the seventeenth sūrah is known as *The Children of Israel* "in Arabic codices."¹⁹ Other notes rightly point out that the origin of certain peculiar Latin usages is the Arabic syntax that lies beneath

¹⁷ See *Bibliothèque Nationale. Catalogue général des manuscrits latins* vol. 5 (Paris, 1966), p. 340.

¹⁸ I argued at some length for this view that only one author is responsible for the many annotations to the text of *Liber denudationis* in my "Spain's Arab Christians," pp. 201-206.

¹⁹ "Azoara haec in codicibus arabicis inscribitur filiorum israel" (B. N. ms. lat. 3394, fol. 109v lm c. ll. 2-4).

them. A marginal annotation late in *Liber denudationis*, for example, tells us that *Quod si dixerit dicens . . .* ("Now if someone should say. . .")²⁰ is an *arabismus purus* (fol. 258r lm c. l. 14); and, indeed, it is very common in Arabic to follow a verb of speaking with an active participle of the same verb which serves to mark off quoted speech. In some instances such observations as these are even useful in determining the meaning of the Latin text. On fol. 247v, for example, the Latin version of *Liber denudationis* accuses Muḥammad, who supposedly borrowed many things from the Bible, of being a *computator*. A marginal note rightly proposes that what is meant here is "plagiarist". *Computator*, the note tells us, is used "according to the Arabic sense"; and, in fact, one Arabic equivalent for *computator* used in the sense of "reckoner" or "compiler" is *mu'allif* which also means both "author" and "compiler" and occasionally "plagiarist."²¹ The author of this annotation then proceeded to emend the Latin text to read *plagiarius*.²²

In general the annotations to *Liber denudationis* consist of periodic summaries of the work's main points, and do not normally presuppose any special knowledge of Islam, though a few notes do contain accurate information drawn from sources other than the text of *Liber denudationis* itself. One note, for example, correctly observes that the monk called Boheira (i.e. the Syrian monk Bahīrā of Islamic tradition) in the Latin text is "vulgarly called Sergius among us."²³ But typically these abundant summarizing notes bespeak far more industry than profound understanding of Islam. There is nothing here like the insightful commentary of the much earlier Annotator of Robert of Ketton's translation of the Qur'ān.²⁴ Moreover, the numerous marginal corrections of the

²⁰ See *Liber denudationis* 10.14.

²¹ See R. Dozy, *Supplément* 1, p. 34a.

²² "Computator, iuxta sensum arabicum" (B. N. ms. lat. 3394, fol. 247v lm c. ll. 11-12; cf. *Liber denudationis* 7.13); for other examples see 246r rm c. ll. 6-9; 243r rm c. ll. 15-18; and 248r rm c. ll. 8-10).

²³ "Sergius apud nos vulgo vocatur" (B. N. lat. 3394, fol. 243v lm c. l. 8, com. on Boheira; cf. *Liber denudationis* 5.1, and N. Daniel, *Islam and the West*, p. 5).

²⁴ See chapter two above, pp. 84-89.

text are clearly intended to improve the unimpressive medieval Latin. The typical medieval-Latin phrase *per hoc credidimus certitudinaliter*, for example, is changed to *hoc cum certitudine credidimus*,²⁵ and the first two words of a sentence beginning *Et iustificati*. . . are changed to *Iustificati autem*. . . in order to give the text a Ciceronian feel.²⁶ A quick glance at the critical apparatus in the edition below makes clear that the corrections to the Latin text are largely of this kind.

But despite the omnipresence of these notes, and their rather well-informed content, there is absolutely nothing in them to indicate that their author or authors made use of another Latin or Arabic manuscript of *Liber denudationis* as they wrote them. They therefore provide little help in establishing the original text of this work beyond the occasional insight they provide into the Arabic that lies behind problematic Latin passages. Sometimes, in fact, these seventeenth-century notes and corrections only make matters worse, such as, for example, when *sanguinem* ("blood") is expunctuated from verse 2:173 on fol. 240r, l. 3, even though the Arabic of the Qur'ān surely requires it.²⁷

*

The Reliability of B. N. Lat. 3394: Since the copious notes in the folios of the *Liber denudationis* do not shed much useful light on the text, and since there are no other manuscripts of the work,²⁸ we are left with only the uncorrected version of the text preserved in B. N. lat. 3394, a manuscript which the late Professor M.-Th. d'Alverny described as an "execrable copy executed. . . by an ignorant scribe."²⁹ So problematic did she think this manuscript to be, in fact, that she doubted that the work could be properly edited on the basis of it.³⁰ It is only fitting, therefore, that I explain my decision to do exactly that.

²⁵ See *Liber denudationis* 1.1 and accompanying critical apparatus.

²⁶ See *Liber denudationis* 1.2 and accompanying critical apparatus.

²⁷ See *Liber denudationis* 2.3.

²⁸ Except for certain fragments discussed below.

²⁹ M.-Th. d'Alverny, "Deux traductions," p. 114.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 126.

In one sense my decision requires no apology. As I hope the preceding chapters of this study have shown, *Liber denudationis* is a work of enough importance and interest to other scholars that an edition of it should be made based on whatever manuscripts are available, execrable or not.

But beyond this there are three points which should be made in defence of the reliability of B. N. lat. 3394. The first is that many of the textual problems which M.-Th. d'Alverny would attribute to the incompetence of the 16th-century copyist are, rather, very often the fault of the hurried medieval translators. It would be difficult to demonstrate this, since the original Arabic version of the work is lost, were it not for the fact that so much of the text consists of very close translations of Qur'ānic verses and Islamic traditions with which the text as we have it can be compared. By doing so it becomes apparent that B. N. lat. 3394 is much more reliable than it has been given credit for.

A few examples of particularly troublesome passages will illustrate my point. In chapter nine, while demonstrating the contradictions of the Qur'ān, the author cites sūrah 77, verses 35 and 36, which in the manuscript read as follows: *Illa est dies non loquitur nec dabitur eis loquendi licentia*.³¹ On first reading it would appear that some word or phrase must have been left out between *dies* and *non*, since *loquitur* and *dabitur* have no obvious subject and these two sentences make little sense together as they stand. But when this problematic Latin is compared with the Arabic of the Qur'ān, the difficulty is quickly resolved. The Arabic reads as follows: *Hādhā yawm lā yaṭīqūna wa-lā yu'dhanu la-hum fa-ya'tadhirūna*. Besides incorrectly rendering the plural *yaṭīqūna* ("they speak") with the singular *loquitur*, the translators have misunderstood that the clauses beginning with *lā* are, in the terms of Arabic grammar, in construct with *yawm*, and this is what has caused the problem.³² Correctly translated, the above verse would read "This is the day *on which* they will not

³¹ *Liber denudationis* 9.3.

³² For other examples of this comparatively rare kind of construct, see W. Wright, *A Grammar of the Arabic Language*, 3rd ed., rpt. Beirut, 1974, vol. 2, p. 200.

speak, nor will they be given permission to plead.” Paying little attention to the sense of the passage, the translators rendered it incorrectly, giving the impression of a lacuna where there is none.³³

Later in chapter nine the author cites verse 7:187 of the Qur’ān, part of which appears in the text as follows: *Dic quoniam scientia eius apud Deum. Non revelabit horam eius nisi ipse.*³⁴ The first sentence is clear enough: “Say that the knowledge of it is with my God.” But the next sentence seems garbled; the *nisi ipse* at the end does not fit with the rest of the construction and cannot be construed with the following sentence (*Idem dicit in Capitulo Lo <cqu> eman. . .*) which introduces a new topic. Once again, however, comparing these lines with the Arabic of the Qur’ān solves the problem: *Qul innamā ‘ilmuhā ‘inda rabbī; lā yujallihā li-waqtihā illā huwa.* (“Say, the knowledge of it is with my Lord. No one but He will reveal it in its time.”) The translators have once again rendered this verse word for word with little attention to the sense. The main difficulty is that *lā* in this case cannot be understood simply as a negative particle (which is its normal function); in conjunction with *illā huwa* (“except he”) at the end of the sentence it means “no one but he”. No lacuna has been introduced here by a lackadaisical copyist; an overly literal translation has merely made it seem so.

These are two of many examples of quotations of the Qur’ān or Ḥadīth in which overly literal translation has made for difficulty in understanding the text—to such an extent in these two instances that there appears to have been textual corruption. This being so, it is only reasonable to assume that the same sorts of infelicities of translation occurred in parts of the text that are *not* citations of the Qur’ān or Ḥadīth. Now although the Arabic original of the *Liber denudationis* has been lost, in some passages (as the seventeenth-century annotator(s) noticed) the original construction shines through the clumsy Latin so clearly that there is

³³ N. b. that the seventeenth-century annotator(s) solved the problem by adding *in qua* between *dies* and *non*; see *Liber denudationis* 9.3 and commentary and critical apparatus.

³⁴ *Liber denudationis* 9.23.

little difficulty in demonstrating that such a translation error has occurred.

A good example of such a passage is the second paragraph of the work which begins *Et infra extitimus*. . .³⁵ The verb *extitimus* fairly clearly means "we stood apart" in this sentence, but the phrase *Et infra* which precedes it is quite difficult to make sense of. It might mean "and below", but below what? No physical location—either high or low—has been mentioned. It might mean "later in the text", but this makes little sense in the context: how could we have "stood apart" later in the text? Perhaps it means "later in time", but no time period has been mentioned yet to be later than. We do not have recourse here to the original Arabic as in the above examples, but we do have one very important clue to help us. The whole of the preceding paragraph³⁶ quite clearly consists of the typical introductory remarks found in virtually all Arabic books and treatises, whether by Muslims or Christians. Invariably such remarks begin, as they do here, with "In the name of God," and God is then lavishly praised, asked for His aid, and given the credit for any success that may come to the writing at hand. After all this the work itself begins, and in nearly every case a wholly formulaic phrase is used to separate this introduction from the body of the work itself. Normally that phrase is the *ammā ba'du*, familiar to every Arabist, a phrase which has no intelligible literal meaning³⁷ but which might be translated "Now then. . ." Occasionally, however, a variation of this phrase, *wa-ba'du*, is used, as for example in the tenth-century Mozarabic adaptation of Orosius' *Historiae adversus paganos*.³⁸ Also meaning "Now then. . .", these two words literally mean "and" and "after", which *Et* and *infra* translate quite nicely. Since the body of the work begins with *extitimus* ("We stood apart") *Et infra* stands precisely where one would expect to find *wa-ba'du*. Here again, therefore, it is clear that what at first appeared to be a case

³⁵ *Liber denudationis* 1.2.

³⁶ *Liber denudationis* 1.1.

³⁷ *ammā* means "as for"; *ba'du* means "afterward".

³⁸ See Ūrūsīūs, *Tārīkh al-ʿālam* 1. 1, p. 54; on this work see P. van Koningsveld, "La literatura cristiano-árabe," pp. 696, 703; and H. Daiber, "Orosius' *Historiae adversus paganos* in arabischer Überlieferung," *passim*.

of textual corruption is really an instance of overly literal translation.³⁹

There are a few obvious lacunae in the text—passages where a copyist has clearly left something out,⁴⁰ and there are other clear scribal errors that have required emendation. But these account for very few of the difficult passages of the text. Most such difficulties arise from the kind of translation problems illustrated in these three examples. The problem is not that B. N. lat. 3394 is so execrable; the medieval translation is simply awkwardly literal and occasionally unintelligible.

The second point that must be made in defense of this manuscript's reliability is that while it is the only witness to the complete text of *Liber denudationis*, many passages of the work, including most of chapter twelve, were borrowed by Riccoldo da Monte di Croce in his *Contra legem Sarracenorum*, and these passages in the two works are often virtually identical. Since the earliest extant manuscript of Riccoldo's work (a manuscript which Riccoldo apparently owned himself and which forms the base text of Méri-goux's edition) is from the early 14th century, we can reasonably assume that the work has not suffered enormous corruption in the roughly two-hundred-year interval between the composition of *Contra legem Sarracenorum* and the copying of B. N. lat. 3394.⁴¹

A third indication of the general reliability of B. N. lat. 3394 is to be found in the relatively uncorrupted state of the many transliterated Arabic words preserved in it. Now there are some

³⁹ Another interpretation of what *Et infra* means is provided by the twelfth-century *Glossarium* which (p. 167) says that the phrase *et infra* corresponds to the Arabic phrase *wa-naḥwa ḥādhā*, another idiom which means something like "In that connection," or "In regard to this." This interpretation, however, does not suit this particular context.

⁴⁰ E. g., *Liber denudationis* 7.10; 7.11; 8.1.

⁴¹ For a list of those portions of *Liber denudationis* which appear in Riccoldo's *Contra legem sarracenorum* in nearly verbatim form, see the Appendix at the end of this study. On this early ms. (Florence, Bibl. Nazionale., *Conv. Sopp.* C. 8.1173, fols. 185r-218r) of the *Contra legem sarracenorum* owned by Riccoldo himself see J.-M. Méri-goux, "L'ouvrage d'un frère prêcheur," pp. 6-11, 36, 38. On the uncertain dating of the translation of *Liber denudationis*, see chapter two above, p. 62.

Romanized Arabic words here which are very difficult to decipher as a result of a certain amount of deformation, such as the ponderous *Quad Efflegelmon* in 9.3 which is a corruption of *qad aflaha al-mu'minūn* ("The believers have prospered"), part of the first verse of the twenty-third sūrah; there are also instances in which the manuscript preserves transliterations which were incorrect to start with, such as when the translators mistook *al-Hijr*, an area between Medina and Syria, for *al-hajar*, meaning "rock" or "stone," and so transliterated it *Elhagar*;⁴² finally, there are Romanized words, especially names, which seem to be beyond recognition, such as the name *Mahe* which appears in the *isnād* of a quoted ḥadīth and corresponds to no Arabic name that I know of.⁴³ But when compared particularly with later manuscripts of Riccoldo's *Contra legem Sarracenorum*, the state of the names in B. N. lat. 3394 is quite good. B. N. lat. 3394 records the name of the miraculous horse which Muḥammad rode on his Night Journey as *Elberak* (see 12.2) which is doubtless exactly how the translators rendered the Arabic *al-Burāq*. Later manuscripts of Riccoldo's work have such deformations as the Latinized *Alboracum*, or the garbled *Elberahil*, *Abanliz*, or *Barahit* when they quote precisely this same passage from *Liber denudationis*.⁴⁴

For these three reasons it is probable that though B. N. lat. 3394 was copied in the sixteenth century, it was probably carefully copied from what was itself a very early manuscript of *Liber*

⁴² See *Liber denudationis* 3.4 and commentary.

⁴³ See *Liber denudationis* 4.5.

⁴⁴ See E. Cerulli's edition from three later manuscripts of Riccoldo's version of the Night Journey, which was widely known and was borrowed directly from ch. twelve of *Liber denudationis*, in his *Il "Libro della Scala,"* pp. 348, 350. Even Riccoldo's own fourteenth-century ms. has *Elberak* once, but also contains the less exact *Elberahk* and *Albarak*; see *Contra legem sarracenorum* 14, pp. 122-23. It is also clear that B. N. lat. 3394 preserves much better readings than these manuscripts in other ways as well. Where B. N. lat. 3394 has "Numquid *missum* est pro eo?" as the question asked by the angels of Gabriel, and this is clearly what the Arabic sources for this passage require, other mss. of Riccoldo's work (though not the earliest) have the more easily understood "Numquid *missus* est . . ." (see *ibid.*, p. 348-49, and *Liber denudationis* 12.3 and commentary). Both the principle of *lectio difficilior* and the sources indicate that our ms. has the better reading therefore.

denudationis.⁴⁵ Though another manuscript or two would surely simplify the task of editing *Liber denudationis*, I believe, therefore, that B. N. lat. 3394 does contain the text of that work substantially as the translators first wrote it down and that it may be used with some confidence as the basis for a critical edition.⁴⁶

*

Editorial Principles and Conventions: The basic principle guiding my edition of *Liber denudationis* has, of course, been to present a text which matches the original translation as closely as possible. But the fact that a number of passages of *Liber denudationis* are quoted or paraphrased in Riccoldo da Monte di Croce's *Contra legem Sarracenorum* complicates somewhat the process of establishing that original text. As I have mentioned, the *Contra legem Sarracenorum* not only exists in many manuscripts, but Riccoldo's own fourteenth-century manuscript is still extant and has been used by Mérigoux as the basis for his critical edition of the work. For the portions of *Liber denudationis* that are quoted in *Contra legem Sarracenorum*, therefore, we have a much earlier and potentially much more accurate witness to the original text than that preserved in B. N. 3394. Indeed, in some instances these quoted portions clearly supply more accurate readings. In *Liber denudationis* 12.3, for example, the text of B. N. lat. 3394 says that al-Burāq "was placing the rod (*virgula*) of his foot on the horizon of his vision," while Riccoldo's quotation of the same passage says that he "was placing the hoof (*ungula*) of his foot on the horizon of his vision." Now the latter reading makes more sense in any case, but the Arabic accounts of Muḥammad's Night Journey, one or several of which are the source of this whole

⁴⁵ In her last comments on *Liber denudationis* M.-Th. d'Alverny likewise suggested that the version of the work preserved in our ms. must have been copied from a fairly early manuscript which circulated among Dominican friars, such as Martí and Riccoldo, who studied oriental languages for missionary purposes; see her "Marc de Tolède," p. 48.

⁴⁶ On the problems raised by the translation itself, see chapter two above, pp. 55-61.

chapter, tell us that al-Burāq “was placing his hoof (*ḥāfirahu*) at the edge of his field of vision.”⁴⁷ Riccoldo’s quotation, therefore, clearly has the proper reading, *virgula* being a later copyist’s misreading of *ungula*. Furthermore, Riccoldo’s own manuscript of *Contra legem Sarracenorum* frequently has sounder versions of transliterated Arabic names than our manuscript. In *Liber denudationis* 6.1, for example, B. N. lat. 3394 has *Honira* for the Arabic name *Ḥamzah* while Riccoldo’s manuscript has *Homra* which, as I will show presently, is probably just how the translators mistakenly Romanized the name.⁴⁸ Likewise in *Liber denudationis* 6.2, B. N. lat. 3394 has *Meteban filius Eleken* where Riccoldo’s manuscript has *Merebam filius Elhekem* which corresponds more closely to the proper Arabic version of this name, *Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam* (the fourth Umayyad caliph, d. 685).

But even though Riccoldo’s manuscript of *Contra legem Sarracenorum* does contain these superior readings in passages quoted from *Liber denudationis*,⁴⁹ I have not used this manuscript as the base text for those portions of *Liber denudationis* which it quotes; for frequently Riccoldo paraphrases passages which he has taken from *Liber denudationis* rather than quoting them directly,⁵⁰ and in some cases he partly quotes and partly paraphrases portions from that work.⁵¹ Since he was often willing to paraphrase rather than quote, one cannot be certain that he has not changed a word here and there in the passages which he appears to be quoting verbatim. What appears, therefore, to be a better reading supplied by one of these passages may very well simply be his own emendation or reworking of a particularly difficult portion of the original text. As a result, since it is normally impossible to be certain

⁴⁷ See commentary to *Liber denudationis* 12.3.

⁴⁸ See just below.

⁴⁹ Sometimes the reverse is true too. In the first line of *Liber denudationis* 12.7, B. N. lat. 3394 has *dicit auctor* where Riccoldo’s ms. has *dicit actor*; the former is clearly correct here.

⁵⁰ See, e. g., his paraphrase of the second half of *Liber denudationis* 7.11 in *Contra legem sarracenorum* 8, p. 95, ll. 132-37.

⁵¹ Cf. *Contra legem sarracenorum* 3, p. 72, ll. 44-48 which are partly verbatim quotation and partly paraphrase of the last two sentences of *Liber denudationis* 3.3.

when Riccoldo's apparently better readings do actually reflect the original text, my operating principle throughout has been to prefer the readings of B. N. 3394 even when they seem less apt.

I have, however, departed from this principle in cases when the alternative reading supplied by Riccoldo's work can be shown to be the likely original reading. If such an alternative reading conforms better with the Arabic sources of the passage or is clearly required by the sense (or both), I have, as in the case of *ungula/virgula* described just above, adopted that reading supplied by Riccoldo's quotations.

Furthermore, though B. N. 3394 has been the base text throughout, I have been forced to supply a corrected reading myself on occasion when the sense overwhelmingly demands it. At one point, for example, the manuscript has "*Nos, inquam in personam Dei, descendere fecimus recordationem Dei. . . (3.4)*" Clearly, however, *inquit* is needed here in place of *inquam*, for the author is citing verse 15:9 of the Qur'ān so that *inquam in personam Dei* makes little sense. If *inquit* is substituted then this passage, like others in the work (e.g. the first sentence of 8.1), becomes an attack on the Islamic teaching that God himself speaks in the Qur'ān, for it suggests that Muḥammad contrived this verse:

"'We,' he says impersonating God, 'made the remembrance of God descend. . .'"⁵² In so emending the text I have occasionally used corrections supplied by the seventeenth-century annotations when they meet my criteria. In 9.23 the manuscript reads *nec est aliquis de suis sequacibus qui dubitauerit forte resurrectionem in fine centum annorum* which makes little sense as it stands. In this case *forte* has rightly been corrected to *fore* making it a nice accusative-infinitive construction: "And there is no one among his (i. e. Muḥammad's) followers who doubted that the resurrection would be at the end of a hundred years." I have retained this emendation.⁵³

⁵² This is a common medieval Christian method of undermining Qur'ānic authority. See N. Daniel, *Islam and the West*, pp. 35-37.

⁵³ In at least one case I have retained such a marginal correction because it is supported by the Arabic of the Qur'ān and by Riccoldo's quotation of the passage: in *Liber denudationis* 5.2 in a translation of verse 16:103 *cum* has been changed to *quod*, and this reading is in line with the Arabic *anna* of the verse and is exactly what *Contra legem Sarracenorum* has (see critical apparatus there,

Finally, I have occasionally modified the transliterations of Arabic words and names as they stand in B. N. 3394. I have done so, however, only when there is good reason to think that the spelling of the name in the manuscript is different from the spelling of it in the original translation. A simple case of this can be found in 7.2 where the author notes that among the wives of Muḥammad was *Haffa filia Omar*, a corrupt Latin version of *Ḥaṣṣah bint ʿUmar*. Now there is little likelihood that the translators misread *Ḥaṣṣah* as **Haffah* in Arabic script, so they surely would have written *Hafsa*; but there is every possibility that a Latin copyist misread *Hafsa* as *Haffa* since s's in Latin hands often resemble f's very closely and misreading one for the other is common. In cases like this, therefore, where another spelling is likely on the basis of the Arabic spelling and common copying errors could account for the variation, I have emended the spelling to match the Arabic more closely.

Sometimes this process becomes rather complicated because some names experienced more than one misadventure between their original Arabic form and the Latin version in B. N. lat. 3394.⁵⁴ The beginning of chapter six provides two good examples. Here the author names the seven early Muslims whose readings of the Qur'ān were deemed authentic by Ibn Mujāhid. But difficulties abound. Among those named in the manuscript are *Ebon Omar* and *Honira* (6.1). Comparing these names with the Arabic names of the seven—Nāfi', Abū 'Amr, Ḥamzah, al-Kisā'i, 'Āṣim, Ibn Kathīr, and Ibn 'Āmir⁵⁵—it is clear that these two are corruptions of *Abū 'Amr* and *Ḥamzah*. The explanation for their forms in the manuscript is rather involved, however. While *Ebon Omar* is a garbled version of *Abū 'Amr*, each half of the name has suffered a different form of corruption. The translators surely wrote *Ebou*,

where *M* is *Contra legem Sarracenorum*'s reading according to Mérigoux' edition); as far as I can tell this seventeenth-century correction was made only by conjecture, not in reliance on an Arabic version of the Qur'ān.

⁵⁴ For a good overview of this process of deformation which commonly afflicts Arabic words transliterated into medieval Latin, see J. D. Latham, "Arabic into Medieval Latin," passim, esp. 31-39, and "Arabic into Medieval Latin (2)," pp. 120-37.

⁵⁵ See W. Watt, *Bell's Introduction to the Qur'ān*, pp. 48-49.

their usual transliteration of *Abū*,⁵⁶ but a copyist misread the two minims of the *u* for those of an *n*—a common copy error—and wrote *Ebon. Omar*, however, is the common Latin rendering of ‘*Umar*, not ‘*Amr*.⁵⁷ What likely happened here is that the translators simply mistook the Arabic ‘*Amr* for ‘*Umar* and so wrote *Omar*; or the Arabic manuscript itself could have been defective, omitting the final *waw* of ‘*Amr* which is all that distinguishes the two names in writing. As a result, in this case I have emended *Ebon* to *Ebou*, but left *Omar* as it is, since *Ebou Omar* is almost certainly what the translators wrote.

The case of *Ḥamzah/Honira* is more complicated still. Here working in reverse it is easy to see that the *-ni-* segment of the manuscript version is another case of minim confusion: a Latin copyist misread *m* as *ni*. The resulting *Homra*, however, cannot be accounted for on Latin paleographical grounds; a Latin copyist would probably not misread *Hamza* as *Homra*. The translator, however, especially since he was a Christian unfamiliar with important personages in Islamic history, could easily have misread *Ḥamzah* as **Hamrah* since the Arabic *r* and *z* differ by only a (frequently missing) dot; and since the short vowel *a* is not signified in unvocalized Arabic script, he could also have assumed that the name was vocalized with a *ḍamma* (*u*) and thus transliterated it *Homra*.⁵⁸ Here therefore I have emended *Honira* to *Homra*, rather than *Hamza*, because *Homra* is almost certainly what the original translation had.⁵⁹

The above examples illustrate both my method of handling Arabic names and the peculiar challenges involved. The names of Qur’ānic sūrahs, of which the author mentions many, and other occasional Arabic words which the translators have transliterated rather than translated all present exactly the same difficulties,

⁵⁶ Cf. *Eboubeker* = *Abū Bakr* in 6.3.

⁵⁷ Cf. *Omar filius Catheb* for ‘*Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb* in 4.3.

⁵⁸ The short Arabic *u* typically became *o* in Latin.

⁵⁹ N. b. that this is just how the name is spelled in the quotation of this passage in Riccoldo’s *Contra legem sarracenorum* (see the apparatus criticus to *Liber denudationis* 6.1). The remaining problematic names in the manuscript’s list discussed here can all probably be accounted for by similar confusion on the part of the Christian translators or later Latin copyists or both.

which I have resolved in the same ways. One final oddity must be noted before leaving this topic. The hurried translators of the work transliterated the word *Abū* ("Father") used so frequently in Arabic names precisely as they saw it in each instance. Since, however, *Abū* has irregular case endings which cause the word to vary considerably as between each of the three Arabic cases, their transliteration of it varies just as much. Hence where they saw the word in the nominative, we have *Ebou* from *Abū* as I noted just above. When in the genitive they transliterated it *Ebi* from *Abi*, as in *Ebikais* (Mt. *Abi Qubays*) in 9.11. The accusative becomes *Eba* from *Abā* as in *Eba Horeire* (*Abā Hurayrah*) in 10.22.⁶⁰

Aside from these unusual emendation and spelling difficulties, the text does not present other notably peculiar editorial problems. My remaining editorial practices can, therefore, be quickly described.

I have maintained the chapter divisions and chapter headings of the one manuscript for convenience' sake, even though those divisions and headings were probably added by a later Latin copyist rather than being original to either the lost Arabic version or the Latin translation.⁶¹ The numbered paragraph divisions of each chapter, however, have been added by me. I have normally made such divisions at points where they would naturally belong, but on some occasions I have broken up a particularly long paragraph into two or more paragraphs for ease of reference.

Since the edition is based on only one manuscript I have adopted its mostly medieval orthography throughout. Two points should be noted here, however. First, the copyist habitually wrote each *c* preceded by a vowel and followed by an *i* as *t*. This practice I have maintained. Secondly, in departure from medieval practice he attached a cedilla to nearly every *e* which would have been an *ae*-diphthong in classical spelling. These "*e*-cedillas" I have

⁶⁰ In each of these instances it is possible to see from the Latin syntax that these words were almost certainly in the cases mentioned. For example, *Eba Horeire* occurs in this phrase: *Et scribitis quod Eba Horeire quaesiuit*. . . The *quod* translates the Arabic conjunction *anna* which always is followed by a noun in the accusative (even though that noun is normally nominative in force). Seeing *anna Abā Hurayrah*, the translator wrote *quod Eba Horeire*.

⁶¹ See chapter two above, pp. 39-40.

expanded to *ae*. I have also expanded those few to which he did not attach a cedilla for consistency's sake.

Although my edition relies on one manuscript I have not adopted its punctuation because, even though there is an abundance of it throughout, I do not think that it is particularly helpful in clarifying this difficult text. A few points deserve notice here as well. I normally have used dashes (— —) to enclose parenthetical remarks by the author or translators explaining Islamic and Arabic terms and the like. Such explanations occur with some frequency in the middle of Qur'ānic quotations and warrant special punctuation. I have placed angled brackets (< >) around editorial additions, while square brackets ([]) mark off editorial deletions; three asterisks between angled brackets (< * * * >) indicate a lacuna in the text. The folio numbers of B. N. lat. 3394 appear in fancy brackets ({}) within the text.⁶² All transliterated terms other than proper names are in italics, as are all directly quoted passages of the Bible or the Qur'ān. In all other respects I have followed the general punctuation practices used in the English-speaking world.

I have recorded the variant readings supplied by passages of *Liber denudationis* quoted in Riccoldo's *Contra legem Saracenorum*, as well as variants suggested by the seventeenth-century annotations of the one complete manuscript, in the critical apparatus, and in general I have given positive entries; that is, the word or phrase to be explained is repeated in the note followed immediately by a square bracket (]), and then the variant reading is listed. I have followed this procedure because of the nature of the corrections supplied by the marginal annotations: they very often involve the replacement of one word or phrase with a completely different word or phrase so that it is necessary to make clear what is being substituted for what by means of positive entries. In those instances in which the variant is another form of the same word or resembles it closely I have given a negative entry; that is, only the variant is listed in the critical apparatus. A

⁶² When a new folio begins in the middle of the word, I have divided the word by a back slash and placed the bracketed number immediately after, as in the case of folio 245r: "nec habuit popu/lus {245r} Alchoranum."

series of asterisks (***) indicates a series of letters which are illegible in the manuscript. I have included only textually important variants in the notes, leaving out obvious scribal errors such as repetitions or orthographically insignificant misspellings, except in the case of proper names, where I have invariably recorded the manuscript's version of the name, Riccoldo's if the passage is quoted by him in *Contra legem Sarracenorum*, and any variant of the name proposed in the marginal annotations of B. N. 3394. The readings of the original copyist of B. N. 3394 are identified in the critical apparatus by the *siglum* *P*; corrections supplied by the annotations are identified by *P*². Occasionally the author or authors of the annotations have corrected the text twice in two different ways, normally crossing out the first correction. In such instances *P*^{2a} refers to the earlier correction, *P*^{2b} to the later. Readings supplied by Mérigoux' edition of Riccoldo's own manuscript of *Contra legem Sarracenorum* are identified by *M*.⁶³

*

Translation Principles and Conventions: In translating *Liber denudationis* I have attempted, in the words of the distinguished translator Desmond Lee, to both to "bring the English . . . severely close" to the Latin, and at the same time "to produce . . . a swift, natural version."⁶⁴ This two-fold goal seems well-suited to the circumstances, since in this instance in particular the English translation must serve to explicate the many peculiarities of the text. For that purpose, only a "severely close" translation will do. Yet in attempting to provide such a translation I have tried to avoid the very problem which the Latin version of *Liber denudationis* so well exemplifies: an overly literal translation that becomes unreadable at points. I therefore have striven to create a version as swift and natural as the circumstances permit.

⁶³ The passages of *Liber denudationis* which are quoted by Riccoldo are listed in the appendix at the end of the edition together with the appropriate page and line numbers of Mérigoux' edition of the *Contra legem sarracenorum*.

⁶⁴ See his preface to his translation of Plato's *Republic* (2nd ed. Penguin Classics, London, 1974, 1987), p. 9.

In many instances, of course, the accomplishment of one of these goals has meant failure in achieving the other, making the translation at many points a compromise between the two principles. The Latin translators, for example, frequently had difficulty in translating the tenses of Arabic verbs into the very different Latin verbal system. In 10.16, for example, the author recounts certain Islamic ideas about the relationship between the throne (*thronus*) of God and His seat (*sedes*). "And how," he asks, "will the heavens and the earth *be* (*erunt*) within the measure of the seat?" The future *erunt* is clearly rather awkward here, especially since in the Traditional sources for this passage the verbs are all in the present tense.⁶⁵ What almost certainly has happened here is that the translators saw the Arabic *muḍāriʿ* (imperfect) form of the verb *to be* and read it with a future meaning (which it can have in certain circumstances) and unthinkingly translated it thus. In such instances—and they are not infrequent—I have adjusted the tense of the English version to accord with the sense of the passage.

Similarly, when the translators have clearly mistranslated an Arabic construction in such a way that the Latin verges on the meaningless, I have translated the sense of the passage, normally making clear in the commentary what the problem is and how I have resolved it. Often I have done this in situations in which the Arabic sources make it particularly justified, as in the case of the Latin mistranslation in 9.3 of verses 77:35-36 mentioned earlier in this chapter.

In all other cases I have attempted to provide a closely literal translation of what the Latin itself says. This has meant that in instances when the Latin translators clearly misunderstood what the Arabic meant, but still wrote readable Latin, I have provided an English version of the misleading Latin, not of the proper Arabic which stands behind it. In every instance when I can determine that this has happened, however, (and they are usually cases in which the Qurʾān or Ḥadīth have been quoted) I have explained what the Arabic meant and how the translators misunderstood it in the commentary.⁶⁶

⁶⁵ See commentary to *Liber denudationis* 10.16.

⁶⁶ See, e. g., the quotation of verse 31:30 in 9.5 where *fulk* ("ship") was misread by both the Arabic author and the translators as *falak* ("the celestial

In addition to explaining textual and translation problems such as those just mentioned, the commentary to the translation appearing at the bottom of each page serves other purposes as well. Sources other than Qur'ānic and Biblical passages are identified there, as are persons, places, and events mentioned in the text. In many cases I have also provided references to important parallel passages in related works. Transliterated Arabic words, including the names of the sūrahs of the Qur'ān, are explained in this commentary when it is possible to do so. The meanings of unusual Islamic or Arabic turns of phrase (e. g., *calco* ["to tread"] meaning "to have sex with" on the model of the Arabic *waṭi'a* in 7.11) are provided there. A single asterisk (*) before a word in the commentary signifies that the word is a hypothetical or non-existent form.

Other than in the cases of the names of the Prophet and his Holy Book, which I have spelled in properly transliterated Arabic (*Muhammad* rather than *Machometus* and *Qur'ān* rather than *Alchoranus*), I have used the Latin version's spelling of Romanized Arabic names,⁶⁷ giving the proper modern transliteration in the commentary (except, of course, when I have not been able to identify what the original Arabic name was), together with the identification of the person or thing in question. All Latin names I have converted into their modern equivalents when there is any difference between the two (*Jonah*, for example, rather than *Iona* in 8.6).

Angled brackets (< >) surround words or phrases which do not correspond directly to the Latin text, but are implied by it, and which I have added to clarify the meaning in some way. Just as in the Latin edition, I have placed parenthetical comments of the author or translators on Qur'ānic verses between dashes (— —),

sphere") who translated it *firmamentum*; and the quotation of verse 36:55 in 9.20 where the translators wrongly translated *fākihūn* ("the happy ones," "the merry ones") as *fructificantes* ("the fruitful ones").

⁶⁷ I have adopted this policy because, out of all the transliterated Arabic words in the text, only *Machometus* and *Alchoranus* have become not only Romanized but Latinized as well, with properly Latin declensions having been added to each. Since the translators treat them as Latin words, I have also, translating them into their typical modern English (fully transliterated) forms.

and lacunae in the text are indicated by three asterisks between angled brackets (< * * * >). All Qur'ānic and Biblical quotations are in italics with the sūrah/verse or book/chapter/verse identification provided in parentheses immediately afterward within the text itself. Transliterated Arabic words other than personal names are in italics as well, including the titles of the sūrahs of the Qur'ān.

The abbreviations and short titles used in the commentary are the same as those used in the rest of this study; see the list of abbreviations at the beginning of the work.

< LIBER DENUDATIONIS SIUE OSTENSIONIS
AUT PATEFACIENS > ¹

1.1] {237v} In nomine Patris, Patris saeculorum, et Filii, Filii resurrectionum, et Spiritus Sancti, uiuificatoris eorum qui sunt in sepulchris: vnitatis in Trinitate, Trinitatis in unitate, qua creauit nos de terra, et transtulit nos in generationes et lumbos, et effigiauit <nos> in matricibus, et statuit nobis auditus et uisus et iuuamenta et intellectus, et constituit nos de melioribus hominum cum monstrauit nobis sua miracula et factorum suorum potentiam (et per² hoc credidimus certitudinaliter),³ et⁴ edocuit nos semitas veritatis, et ostendit nobis uestigia suae potentiae et loca suae sapientiae. Laudabimus igitur eum desuper eius gratiis demonstratis, et regratiabimur⁵ ei de munificentiis eius continuatis, petemusque ab eo stabilimentum in hoc quod ipse [nos] direxit, et prosperitatem uerbi et operis ad ipsum propinquare <nos> facientis ut finem sigillet; quia pius et misericors est in aeternum.

1.2] Et infra,⁶ extitimus de declinantibus a sua recordatione et blasphemantibus in legem suam quam elegit sibi ipsi, damnantes infidelitatem quam super corda nostra impresserat diabolus.⁷ Et mansimus palpitantes in nostra caecitate et stultitia donec intelleximus conditiones in quibus versabamur, Alchorani uidelicet et fabularum seu narrationum de traditionibus suis, et contrarietate *elfolicha*, id est perfectorum in lege Machometi. Et⁸ iustifi/cati⁹

¹ Il-Fulika [in letras arabicas] ELFOLICA siue ALPHOLICHA. Hoc est Alchorani ac Mahometanae legis ab ipsis orientalibus confutatio seu perfectorum in leges praecepta. Caput unum. P^{2a}: Alchorani ac Mahometanae legis ab ipsis orientalibus confutatio seu perfectorum in leges. Caput unum. P^{2b}

² per] in P^{2a}

³ per hoc. . . certitudinaliter] hoc cum certitudine credidimus P^{2b}

⁴ et] ipse P²

⁵ regratiabimur] gratias reddemus P²

⁶ Et infra] Nos autem P²

⁷ damnantes infidelitatem. . . diabolus *post* caecitate et stultitia donec *infra* transp. P²

⁸ *post* et add. impostura ***** P^{2a} sed verba haec exp. P^{2b}

⁹ Et iustificati] Iustificati autem P²

<THE BOOK OF DENUING OR EXPOSING
OR THE DISCLOSER>

1.1] In the name of the Father, the Father of the ages, and of the Son, the Son of the resurrections, and of the Holy Spirit, the giver of life to those who are in tombs: a unity in Trinity, a Trinity in unity, through which He created us from earth, and carried us forward through begettings and loins, and fashioned us in wombs, and established for us senses of hearing and senses of sight and aids¹ and intellects, and made us to be among the best of men, when He showed us His miracles and the power of His acts (and on account of this we have believed with certainty), and taught us the paths of truth, and displayed to us the signs of His power and the occasions of His wisdom. We will praise Him, therefore, for His demonstrated graces, and we will give thanks to Him for his uninterrupted munificence, and we will ask from Him steadfastness in this <task> which He Himself has guided, and a favorable outcome of the word and the work (which causes us to draw close to Him), so that He may seal the end <of this work>; for He is eternally pious and compassionate.²

1.2] Now then,³ we, condemning the infidelity which the devil had stamped upon our hearts, stood apart from those who turn away from His remembrance, and who blaspheme against His religion which He chose for Himself. And we remained trembling in

¹ "aids" translates the Latin *iuuamenta* which seems out of place here. The translators probably read something like *'uyūn* or *a'yun* which are plurals for "eye" (s.*'ayn*), but mistook what they saw for a plural of *'awn* which means "aid" or "help".

² "pious and compassionate" translates *pius et misericors*; this is doubtless the Latin rendering of the familiar Islamic description of God as *al-rahmān al-rahīm*, "the Merciful, the Compassionate," used throughout the Qur'ān and in Islamic pious language in general.

³ The translators begin this paragraph with the phrase *Et infra*, literally "and below" or "and afterward," which is almost certainly the meaninglessly literal translation of the formulaic Arabic phrase *wa-ba'du* which is used at just such junctures in Arabic texts and which is best translated "Now then. . ." See pp. 226-27 above.

{239r} sumus de eo¹ in quo fuimus, certificatique sumus² quod recepit nos³ ad paenitentiam et de patientia sua circa ignorantes. Nos igitur rogamus ut firmet nos in huiusmodi,⁴ et ut concedat tibi, O insipiens, librum istum intelligere quem nominavius *Denudationis siue ostensionis, aut patefacientem* in quo⁵ patefecimus aduersus contrariantes nobis⁶ infidelitatem et deuiationem suam. Et si huic operi mendacium obiecerunt,⁷ Alchoranum suum mendosum ostendunt⁸ et suum prophetam et quod transtulerunt ex eodem sui⁹ sotii et sequaces usque impraesentiarum, quia nos non respondebimus eis nisi de suo volumine et de suorum narratoribus¹⁰ sotiorum.

¹ *post de add. errore P²*

² *sumus exp. P²*

³ *post nos add. Deus P²*

⁴ *post huiusmodi add. credulitate P²*

⁵ *Denudationis. . . in quo] denudatum suo fucato (?) et palam factis illis erroribus quos in hoc libro P^{2a} sed verba haec exp. et textum primum rest. P^{2b}*

⁶ *add. et opposcentes P^{2a} sed verba haec exp. P^{2b}*

⁷ *obiecerint P²*

⁸ *ostendent P²*

⁹ *sui] ipsius P²*

¹⁰ *narrationibus P²*

our blindness and stupidity until we understood the circumstances in which we dwelt, that is, <the circumstances> of the Qur'ān, and of the fables or narrations of his traditions,¹ and the contradiction of the *elfolicha*,² that is, the men completely knowledgeable in the religion of Muḥammad. And we have been pardoned for that <condition> in which we were, and we have been made certain that He has brought us back to penitence, and <that He does this> out of His patience toward the ignorant. Therefore we ask that He strengthen us in this, and that He allow you, O foolish one, to understand this book which we have named <*The Book*> of *Denuding or Exposing, or The Discloser*, in which we have made clear the infidelity and error of those who oppose us. And if they this work of any lie, they <merely> demonstrate that their Qur'ān is mendacious, as well as their prophet and that which his companions and followers down to the present have handed down from him,³ for we will not respond to them except on the basis of his volume and the narrators of his companions.

¹ I. e., the Ḥadīth.

² *elfolicha* is doubtless the corrupted transliteration of *al-fuqahā'*, "the *faqḥs*" or theological-legal scholars so important in Islamic civilization. See C. Lohr, "Ramon Llull, Liber Alquindi," p. 158.

³ "that which . . . from him," i. e., the Ḥadīth.

SECUNDUM CAPITULUM.¹ DE VANITATE
VENIENTIUM AD LEGEM MACHOMETI
SIUE TENTENTIUM EAM.

2.1] Quatuor autem² sunt partes³ tenentium Machometi errorem. Prima pars ingressa est Sarracenismum⁴ eorum qui per gladium intrauerunt, et nunc etiam suum cognoscentes errorem resipiscerent nisi gladium formidarent. Et⁵ pars alia intrauit⁶ illorum qui decepti a Diabolo credunt vera esse quae falsa sunt. Tanta enim simplicitatis erant agrestes homines quibus Machometus persuasit quod⁷ de crustulis vel panibus latis interrogabant⁸ cuiusmodi lignamina erant. Tertia pars est eorum qui a proge/nitorum {239v} errore discedere uolunt, sed dicunt se tenere quae⁹ patres eorum tenuerunt; a quorum patrum potius recedunt sententia qui pro idolatria quam tenebant sectam Machometi¹⁰ minus malam sine dubio elegerunt. Quarta pars est eorum qui [propter] laxiorem vitam in uxorum multitudine et aliis concessis licentiis¹¹ plus quam eternitatem alterius seculi dilexerunt.

2.2] Insuper dixit eis eorum dominus Machometus, “vos diuidemini post me in septuaginta tres diuisiones, quarum pars una liberabitur et residuum igni deputabitur.” Haec autem narratio siue historia nota est apud eos quam non respuit neque sapiens neque stultus, quae sic scripta est: “Retulit autem mihi pater meus, qui

¹ Secundum capitulum] Secundum caput *et haec verba post siue tententium eam infra transp.* P²

² autem *exp.* P²

³ *post partes add. siue sectae* P²

⁴ *post Sarracenismum add. scilicet* P²

⁵ Et *exp.* P²

⁶ *post intrauit add. siue est* P²

⁷ quod] ut P²

⁸ interrogarent P²

⁹ quod P²

¹⁰ *post Machometi add. quasi* P²

¹¹ *post licentiis add. prauis* P²

THE SECOND CHAPTER. ON THE VANITY
OF THOSE ENTERING THE RELIGION OF MUḤAMMAD
AND OF THOSE HOLDING TO IT.

2.1] Now there are four groups who hold to the error of Muḥammad. The first group <which> entered into Islam¹ <consists> of those who entered because of the sword, and even now, recognizing their error, they would recover their senses except that they fear the sword. And another group entered <consisting> of those who, deceived by the Devil, believe to be true those things which are false. Indeed the rural men whom Muḥammad persuaded were of such simplicity that they would ask what sort of wood pastries or broad bread were <made of>. The third group is <made up> of those who want to depart from the error of their ancestors, but they <nevertheless> say that they hold to those things which their ancestors held. Instead they draw back from the <originally idolatrous> opinion of those ancestors who, in place of the idolatry which they used to hold, doubtless chose the sect of Muḥammad as less evil. The fourth group is <made up> of those who loved the laxer life among a multitude of women and among the other freedoms allowed <by that religion> more than the eternity of the other world.²

2.2] Moreover, their lord Muḥammad said to them, “after me you will be divided into seventy-three divisions, of which one part will be set free and the rest will be sent to the fire.” Now this narrative or history is known among them, and neither the learned man nor the ignorant reject it; it is written thus: “My father related to me who said, Ahmed Elhasen son of Rasik related to me, who said, the father of Rikarak related to us, who said,

¹ “Islam” translates *Sarracenismus* which can mean either the Islamic realm and people or the religion of Islam; cf. Du Cange, *Glossarium mediae et infimae latinitatis* [editio nova] t. 7, p. 308 a & b.; but note that the translators use the same word below to mean simply “the religion of Islam;” see 9.17.

² The *Quadruplex reprobatio* has very similar views about followers of Muḥammad; see fols. 158va-158vb.

dixit: retulit mihi Ahmed Elhasen filius¹ Rasik, qui dixit, retulit nobis pater Rikarak, qui dixit, retulit nobis Abdalla filius Befir, qui dixit, retulit nobis Malik de filio Zahri, qui dixit, audiui Machometum dicentem, ‘diuidetur populus meus post me in septuaginta tres diuisiones, quarum una diuisio salua erit; residuum igni deputabitur.’” Omnes autem haec² recipiunt, Alchoranum et narrationes traditionum, nec est super his diuersitas inter istos. Quilibet autem dicit se esse de septuagesima tertia diuisione.

2.3] Machometus autem dedit suis sibi ipsi contrarium Alchoranum, et commentati sunt eum plus quam quadraginta uiri, quorum omnium nec saltem duo in expo/sitione {240r} vnus sententiae conuenerunt; sicut fuit Dauid Orientalis qui maximus est apud illos, qui quia dixit Alchoranus, *Anathematizaui uobis morticinum et sanguinem³ et carnes suillas*, et quia non dixerat “et suem uel porcum,” dixit licite posse comedi ab eis ius uel sanguinem carniū suillarum. Iterum quia solum hoc dixerat Alchoranus: *Cognoscite de mulieribus uobis placentibus duas et tres et quatuor*, dixit Dauid ille nouem vxores posse accipi iuxta legem: “uel digitis computate,” ait, “duae et tres et quatuor—nonne penitus erunt nouem?” Contrarietates autem exponentium

¹ filius *P*²: filii *P*

² *post haec add.* probant ac *P*²

³ et sanguinem *exp.* *P*²

Abdalla son of Befir related to us, who said, Malik related to us from the son of Zahri, who said, I heard Muḥammad saying, 'My people will be divided after me into seventy-three divisions, of which one division will be saved; the rest will be sent to the fire.'¹ All accept these, <namely> the Qur'ān and the narrations of the traditions, and there is not any disagreement among them in regard to these. But each <division> says that it is the seventy-third division.²

2.3] But Muḥammad gave to his <followers> the Qur'ān which contradicts itself, and more than forty men have commented on it, among all of whom not even two have agreed in their explanation of one sentence. An example was David the Oriental,³ who is the greatest among them, who, since the Qur'ān said, *I made carrion and blood and swine flesh anathema to you* (2:173, 16:115), and since it did not say, "and pig or pork," said that the juice or blood of pig flesh can licitly be eaten. Again, since the Qur'ān only said this: *Know among women pleasing to you two and three and four* (4:3), this David said that nine wives can be taken according to the law: "and count with the fingers," he says, "two and three and four—are they not nine altogether?"⁴ But I

¹ This is the first of many ḥadīths cited by the author, and the first of several with the complete *isnād*, or chain of authorities ("My father related to me . . .") intact. A number of traditions record Muḥammad saying that just as the Jews and Christians are divided into some seventy divisions (*firaq*) so the Muslims will be divided into seventy-three divisions, of which one will enter paradise, the rest "the fire." See esp. Abū Dāwūd 34 (*sunnah*) 1; 5, pp. 4-6, and Ibn Hanbāl 3. 120, 145. I have not, however, found any such ḥadīth with exactly this *isnād*. Cf. Ricceldo's paraphrase of this passage in *Itinerium* 36.10-11, p. 141.

² I. e., the division which will be saved.

³ Scholars have identified this person as Dāwūd ibn 'Alī ibn Khalaf al-Ḥafḥānī (c. 200-270 A. H.), founder of the Zāhirite school of legal thought to which a small group of Spanish Muslim intellectuals were loyal—the great majority adhering to the Mālikite school. See M.-Th. d'Alverny, "Deux traductions," pp. 126; cf. M. Asín-Palacios, *Abenházam de Córdoba*, 1:118-20, 131-158, 279-329; I. Goldziher, *The Zāhirīs*, passim.

⁴ Dāwūd's works are no longer extant and his teachings are thus only known through the writings of other Zāhirites. Judging from Goldziher's description of his views, however, while the two opinions attributed to him here in the text may not be authentic, they do thoroughly agree with the spirit of Dāwūd's extreme literalism. See I. Goldziher, *The Zāhirīs*, pp. 39ff.

Alchoranum commemoratus sum in libro quem edidi qui uocatur
Extraneorum expositorum.

have recounted the contradictions of the interpreters of the Qur'ān in a book which I published which is called < *The Book* > of the *Peculiarities of the Interpreters*.¹

¹ This (presumably) Arabic work is apparently no longer extant.

CAPITULUM TERTIUM.¹ QUOD MACHOMETUS (sic) NON
ATTESTATUR NEQUE VETUS TESTAMENTUM
NEQUE NOUUM NEQUE MIRACULUM.

3.1] Quaeramus igitur a Machometicis de eorum patrono quem tamquam saluatorem nude—et se saluatos appellant—secuti sunt. Deus enim, charus et gloriosus, nequaquam mittit tam generalem prophetam nisi praecesserit eum qui praenuntiauerit, vel fuerit liber aliquis qui suae testimonium perhibeat prophetiae, sicut de Christo nostro lex et omnes prophe/tae {240v} pene uerbis singulis per multa ante aduentum eius saecula clamarunt. Si enim secta haec tanti orbis in quo diffusa est conuersio esset, et non peruersio, quomodo sanctos prophetas domini latuisset? Sicut quidam eorum ait quia non faciet dominus uerbum nisi reuelauerit secretum suum ad seruos suos prophetas.

3.2] Quod si dixeritis, “praenuntiauit eum Moises in Ueteri Testamento quod Iudei mutauerunt, et Christus in Euangelio sed² uos illud deleuistis,” [sed] contrarium probabimus, quia liber Bibliae, id est Ueteris Testamenti et Euangelii, ante Machometum

¹ Capitulum tertium *post* neque miraculum *infra transp.* P²

² sed] ac P²

THE THIRD CHAPTER. THAT NEITHER THE OLD
TESTAMENT NOR THE NEW NOR ANY MIRACLE
BEARS WITNESS TO MUḤAMMAD.

3.1] Let us ask, therefore, the Muḥammedans about their patron whom they have followed baldly just as a savior—and call themselves the saved. Now God, the esteemed and glorious,¹ by no means sends such a universal prophet unless someone has preceded him who has foretold <his coming>, or <unless> there was some book which put forth testimony of his prophecy, just as the Law and all the prophets cried out about our Christ in almost every word through many ages before His coming. If this sect was a conversion of so much of the world in which it was spread out, and not a perversion, how was it concealed from the holy prophets of the Lord? For certain of them say that the Lord will not create a word unless He will have revealed its hidden meaning to His servants the prophets.

3.2] If you say, “Moses foretold him in the Old Testament which the Jews have altered, and Christ <foretold him> in the Gospel but you effaced that,”² we will prove the opposite, because the book of the Bible, that is of Old Testament and of the Gospel,

¹ “esteemed and glorious” translates *charus et gloriosus*, which itself is doubtless the Latin rendering of one of the typical pious phrases interjected after the name of God by Muslims. The likely Arabic here was *Allāh jalla wa-ʿazza*, “God—He is exalted and mighty— . . .” The limited adoption of such Muslim phraseology was fairly common among Arabic-speaking Christians; see above, ch. 1.

² The Qurʾān (e. g. 61:6; 26:196-97) and the Ḥadīth (e. g. al-Bukhārī 34. 50. 1) both maintain that Muḥammad’s coming was foretold in the Bible, and of course anti-Christian polemical works elaborated extensively on this claim (see A. Bouamama, *La littérature polémique musulmane contre le christianisme*, pp. 199-215 for a thorough discussion). In particular, as evidenced here, Muslims believed that Moses foretold the Prophet’s coming in Deut 18:15,18, (cf. Act 3:22, 7:37) as al-Mahdī asserted in his dialogue with Timothy; see Ṭimāthāwus, *al-Muḥāwarah al-dīniyah* I, p. 148, cf. 170-71. That Christians and Jews “corrupted” their scriptures to hide these prophecies is likewise a claim which Muslims made with Qurʾānic and Traditional justification; see chapter three.

non fuit corruptus, cum fingat Deum sibi dicere quod si quis dubitauerit de dictis suis mittat eum ad librum utriusque Testamenti, sicut dicitur in Alchorano in Capitulo de Iona sic: *Si fuerit in dubio de hoc quod descendere fecimus ad te, sciscitare ab eis qui legunt librum ante te.* Quomodo enim de Deo dubitet aut mendacem Deum dicit mittentem ad mendacia testimonia?

3.3] De quo ipse Machometus in tantum se iactat, ut dicat, “ego sum,” inquit, “dominus filiorum Adam ex prophetis et martiribus et pacificis,” et quod nisi ipse fuisset, *non creasset Deus caelum et terram nec intermedia.* Addidit etiam quod ipse ascendit ad septimum caelum, iter quingentorum annorum, et estimavit se uidisse mirabilia de quibus infra dicemus. Sed quomodo conuenit vt qui in tali statu esset vere tam {241r} gloriosus vt ei angeli apparerent, et ipsum Deum ore tenus alloqueretur, et Deus imponeret ei manus adeo ut, sicut aestimabat, eum manus Dei frigiditas perforaret, de Deo esset dubitans et male credens? Item cum dicat in Capitulo *Elmaiede*, id est “mensa,” quod iudex eius Ebazoheite¹ dixit Machometo

¹ Ebazoene *M*

was not corrupted before Muḥammad, since he¹ pretends that God said to him that if anyone should doubt about his sayings he should send him to the book of each Testament, just as it is said thus in the Qur'ān in the Chapter of Jonah:² *If he were in doubt about this which we made come down to you, let him inquire of those who read the book before you* (10:94).³ Now how can he doubt in regard to God or say that God is a liar who sends <doubters> to lying testimonies?

3.3] Muḥammad boasts about himself so much in regard to this that he says, “from among <all> the prophets and the martyrs and the peaceful,⁴ I am the lord of the children of Adam,” and that but for the fact that he⁵ existed, *God would not have created the heavens and the earth and what is between* (32:4). He added further that he ascended to the seventh heaven, a journey of five hundred years, and thought that he had seen miracles about which we will speak below.⁶ But how is it fitting that he who was truly so glorious, in such a state that angels were appearing to him, and he addressed God Himself by his very mouth, and God placed his hands upon him so that, as he believed, the coldness of the hand of God pierced him,⁷ should be in doubt and misbelief about God? Likewise when he says in the Chapter of *Elmaiede*, that is “the

¹ I. e., Muḥammad.

² Latin: *Capitulum de Iona* from the Arabic *Sūrat Yūnus*, i. e., the Sūrah (10) of Jonah.

³ Cf. Riccoldo's similar use of this verse in *Itinerarium* 34.27, p. 139.

⁴ The Latin *pacificus* which I have translated “peaceful” is probably a mistranslation of the Arabic *ṣāliḥ* which means “godly” or “pious,” but which is from a root that also means “peace” (cf. the *Glossarium* where the verb *pacifico* is defined as *islāḥ*), p. 361. Ḥadīths do report that Muḥammad said “I am the lord of the children of Adam” (see Abū Dāwūd 34 [*sunnah*] 14; 5, p. 54), while Islamic Tradition also believed him to be lord of the prophets. Several good examples can be found in al-Khazraǵī's *Maqāmi' al-ṣulbān*: “Lamma ba'atha [Allāh] sayyid al-nabīyīn wa-al-mursalīn Muḥammadan . . .” “(When God sent the lord of the prophets and messengers, Muḥammad . . .)”, al-Khazraǵī 65, p. 90, cf. 29, p. 57, and 31, p. 59.

⁵ I. e., Muḥammad.

⁶ See 12.1-8 below.

⁷ These occurrences, all drawn from the accounts of Muḥammad's night journey into heaven, are recounted in much more detail below in 12.1-8.

quando¹ Iudei quaerebant iustitiam et iudicium ab eo, et respondit, *Si uenerint ad te, iudica inter eos iuste, quia Deus diligit iustitiam facientes. Et quomodo petent ipsi a te iustitiam, cum sit apud eos Uetus Testamentum in quo est Dei iustitia?*

3.4] Igitur iuxta verbum Machometi non erat lex corrupta ante tempus eius, sed neque post, sicut dicit in Alchorano in Capitulo *Elhagar* quod interpretatur “Lapis:” *Nos*² inquit³ in persona Dei, *descendere fecimus recordationem Dei, et nos eandem custodiemus*. Lex et Euangelium apud eos dicuntur *recordatio*. Deus ergo⁴ semper apud suos fideles testimonium scripturae suae et seruauit ante Machometum et post seruabit incorruptum. Aut

¹ *et sic M*

² *Vos P²*

³ *inquam P*

⁴ *Deus ergo] Quomodo Deus P²*

Table,”¹ that when the Jews were seeking justice and judgement from him, his judge Ebazoheite² told Muḥammad, and he responded, *If they come to you, judge between them justly because God loves those who render justice. And how will they seek justice from you, when they have the Old Testament in which the justice of God resides* (5:42-43)?³

3.4] Therefore according to the word of Muḥammad the <Biblical> law was corrupted neither before his time nor afterward, just as he says in the Qur’ān in the Chapter of *Elhagar*, which is translated “the Stone.”⁴ We, he says impersonating God,⁵ *made the remembrance of God descend, and we will protect the same* (15:9). The Law and the Gospel are among them called “the remembrance.”⁶ Therefore God always preserved the testimony of

¹ Sūrah 5 is called *al-Mā'idah* which, as the translators here explain, means “The Table”.

² I. e., Abū Hurayrah, *Ebazoheite* being a later copyist’s garbling of what was probably *Ebahozeire* in the original translation (Martí has *Ebihoreyra* in his translation of this same passage in the *Explanatio simboli*, p. 454, l. 30; cf. *Quadruplex reprobatio*’s *Hebiboreyra* in its retelling of these same events, fol. 155vb, l. 12). Abū Hurayrah, who died in c. 678, was an important transmitter of Traditions and a Companion of the prophet (see EI² 1:129).

³ The situation described here is similar to one of several sets of circumstances which the commentators suggest may have been the occasion for the revelation of 5:42-43: I. e., that certain Jews arguing about a case of sexual misconduct had asked Muḥammad for his judgement whereupon he recited these verses. But I have come across no mention in any of the commentaries of Abū Hurayrah playing the role of a judge as described here. See al-Tabarī on 5:42; 6, p. 242. Exactly the same events are described in Martí’s translation of the same passage in the *Explanatio simboli*, p. 454, ll. 30-35, and, in a slightly different version, in the *Quadruplex reprobatio*, fol. 155vb.

⁴ Sūrah 15 is known as *al-Hijr*, which is a region in the Hijaz between Medina and Syria. The translators, however, have mistaken *al-Hijr* for *al-hajar* (hence his *Elhagar*), which looks the same in unvocalized Arabic script, and which means “rock” or “stone”.

⁵ “impersonating God” (*in persona Dei*): Most of the Qur’ān takes the form of God speaking to Muḥammad through the angel Gabriel. Medieval Christian polemicists repeatedly draw attention to this fact by some sort of locution as that used here which suggests that Muḥammad himself concocted these statements and put them in the mouth of God. See N. Daniel, *Islam and the West*, pp. 35-37; cf. similar locutions by the Annotator, fol. 27vb lm c. ll. 13-15 and fol. 28va lm c. ll. 19-20.

⁶ “remembrance” here and in the Qur’ānic verse just cited translates the Latin *recordatio* for the Arabic *dhikr* which does indeed mean, among other

quomodo Christiani et Iudei, qui sibi maxime aduersantur, uel etiam isti uel illi, per totum mundum diffusi, cornuum decreto, ubique sacram scripturam falsassent (et ipsi falsarii apud Deum in odium Machometi)? Quod aut occulte fieret et¹ integer remansisset² aliquis codex, aut publice pateretur, et nec historias gentium latuissent.

3.5] Sacra igitur scriptura seruata est {241v} illibata, quae nec in Ueteri Testamento mentionem facit de Machometo nisi ubi loquitur de pseudoprophetis, nec in Euangelio nisi ubi ait, *Attendite uobis a falsis prophetis, qui ueniunt ad uos in pellibus agnorum*, et alibi: *Nonne in nomine tuo prophetauimus?* et infra: *Discedite a me operarii iniquitatis*. Christus autem quasi praecones suos misit omnes prophetas qui suam incarnationem, natiuitatem ex uirgine, passionem et resurrectionem, in caelum ascensionem, deitatem eiusdem mirabilia facientem manifestissime praenuntiauerunt. Et postea ipse ueniens operibus et maximis

¹ et] aut P²

² remaneret P²

His scripture among His faithful before Muḥammad and will preserve it incorrupt after. Indeed how could the Christians and the Jews, who oppose each other in the extreme—both the former and the latter—, everywhere have falsified their holy scripture <in the same way> (and these falsifiers before God stand in the hatred of Muḥammad), while dispersed throughout the world by the decree of the centuries?¹ For either this happened secretly, and some codex would have remained intact, or it was publicly well-known, and these things would not have been concealed from the histories of the nations.²

3.5] Holy Scripture, therefore, has been preserved unharmed; it makes mention of Muḥammad neither in the Old Testament, except where it speaks of pseudo-prophets, nor in the Gospel, except where it says, *Be wary of false prophets who come to you in the skins of lambs* (Mt 7:15), and elsewhere: *Did we not prophesy in your name* (Mt 7:22)? and after that: *Depart from me workers of iniquity* (Mt 7:23).³ But Christ sent as His heralds all the prophets who foretold most clearly his incarnation, birth from a virgin, passion and resurrection, ascension into heaven, <and> His divine nature which worked miracles. And coming afterward He verified these predictions with works and great miracles. In the

things, “recollection” or “remembrance,” although in this verse it means something like “recitation” (Ramon Martí in his translation of this same passage in the *Explanatio simboli* [p. 454, ll. 39-40] translates it *memoriale* which likewise means something like “remembrance” or “memory”). In any event Muslims do not normally refer to the Torah and Gospel by this term; the author suggests that they do so only to make this verse refer to the Bible, even though according to the context and the commentators it refers to the Qur’ān. See e. g. al-Bayḍāwī on 15:9; 1, p. 498; and esp. al-Zamakhsharī on 15:9; 2, p. 572.

¹ “decree of the centuries” translates the peculiar Latin phrase *cornuum decreto* meaning “by the decree of the horns,” which makes little sense. It is likely, however, that the Arabic word which *cornum* translated here was *qarn* which literally does mean “horn,” but which also means “century”, and this is probably the meaning intended here: “by the decree of the centuries”, i. e., “by destiny’s decree,” or “by fate”.

² An argument very similar to that put forward in this last sentence can be found in Riccoldo’s *Itinerarium* 34.20-26, p. 138.

³ The second passage quoted here is part of what Jesus said many will say to Him on the day of judgement; the third passage is his response (cf. Mt 7:21-23).

miraculis praedicta uerificauit. Quemadmodum rex, cum uoluerit proficisci, praecedent et¹ nuntii exercitus nuntiantes aduentum eius. Tandem rex venit et verificatur eius praenuntiatio.

¹ et] eum P²

same way, when a king wants to set out, messengers of the army precede him announcing his coming. At length the king comes and the prediction of him is verified.

QUARTUM CAPITULUM.¹ QUOD PER GLADIUM ET
FALSAS UISIONES POPULUM
CONGREGAUIT.

4.1] Igitur cum nec scriptura testificaretur domino vestro, neque prophetia,² neque euidencia miracula, aut aliqua certitudo, nudauit gladium et primates interfecit, et ait, "Iussit mihi Deus expugnari gentes gladio donec testificentur quod non est deus nisi Deus et quod ego sum nuncius eius, quod si hoc fuerint con/fessi {242r} seruauerunt sanguinem et pecuniam suam." Postquam autem illud intrauerit intellectus hominum, dixit eis Machometus, "Quicumque dixit, 'non est deus nisi Deus,' intrabit paradisum, etsi fornicatus fuerit, etsi fuerit latrocinatus." Et praecepit haec praeconizari. Venit autem ad Machometum quidam dictus Ebidorda, et quaesiuit si hoc esset uerum, et respondidit et addidit, "etiamsi cum precedentibus biberit uinum et etiamsi occiderit." Et adiecit,³ "etiamsi torserit nasum Ebidorda."

4.2] Et infra propheta igitur uester nudauit gladium et uocauit gentes ad legem suam sine certitudine aliqua seu prophetia.

¹ Quartum capitulum *post* populum congregauit *infra transp.* P²

² *post* prophetia *add.* vlla P²

³ etiam si cum precedentibus. . . adiecit M: *om.* P

THE FOURTH CHAPTER. THAT HE¹ GATHERED
PEOPLE BY MEANS OF THE SWORD
AND FALSE VISIONS.

4.1] Therefore, since neither scripture nor prophecy nor miraculous evidence nor any sure sign testified to your lord, he bared the sword and killed the chiefs and said, "God ordered me to attack the nations with the sword until they testify that there is no god but God, and that I am his messenger; if they have confessed this thing, they have saved their blood and their property."² Now after this entered the minds of men, Muḥammad said to them, "Whoever said, 'There is no god but God,' will enter paradise, even if he had fornicated, even if he had stolen." And he ordered these things to be proclaimed. But a certain man named Ebidorda³ came to Muḥammad and asked if this were true, and he responded and added, "Even if, along with those things just mentioned, he drank wine, and even if he killed." And he added, "Even if it tweak the nose of Ebidorda."⁴

4.2] And later,⁵ therefore, the Prophet bared the sword and called the nations to his religion without any sure sign or

¹ I. e., Muḥammad.

² Muslim ibn Ḥajjāj records a tradition with almost exactly these words (though no mention of a sword is made and *expugnari* is rather stronger than *qātala* ["to fight against"] which it translates); see Muslim 1 (*Imān*); 1, pp. 200-12, esp. 210-11. The *Quadruplex reprobatio* (fol. 158va-b) cites a shorter version in the same context attributing it to al-Bukhārī (cf. al-Bukhārī, 56. 102. 6.).

³ I.e. Abū al-Dardā' (d. 652) a Companion of the Prophet; see EI² 1:113-14.

⁴ This is a slightly abbreviated version of a ḥadīth related on the authority of Abū al-Dardā' (see previous note) who, when he went to see the Prophet and was told that those who say "there is no god but God" will enter paradise, asked if this were so even if they had committed sexual sin (*zinā'*) or theft; the Prophet said yes. Astounded, Abū al-Dardā' made Muḥammad repeat his answer three times, so that Muḥammad finally added that this was so '*alā raghm anf Abī al-Dardā'*, i. e., "in spite of the nose of Abū al-Dardā'," a common idiom which means something like "despite Abū al-Dardā's indignation." See Ibn Ḥanbal 6, p. 442; but cf. al-Bukhārī 23. 1. 1 & 79. 30. 3.

⁵ "later" is the only likely translation of the Latin *infra* though that meaning seems awkward in this context. It is likely, therefore, that *infra* translates the Arabic *ba'du* which can mean "later" but also can mean "then." This latter

Dixeruntque ei, “fac nos inuenire ueritatem eorum quae dicis ut sequamur te, quia Deus prophetam non mittit sine aliqua certitudine praecedenti. Quibus dixit Machometus, “Deus dixit mihi, ‘iam destinaui ante te prophetas et eos pro mendacibus habuerunt, timeoque destinare te cum certitudinibus, teque mendacem improperent sicut et missos ante te, ideoque iam misi te cum gladio;’” sicut dicitur in Alchorano in Capitulo Filiorum Isrrael: *Nos non uetati sumus¹ ut mitteremus te cum portentis nisi quia mendatium impositum est praecedentibus* quibus autem fuerit intellectus. Et fideles extiterunt ex² huiusmodi; non curant, etiamsi interficerentur.³

4.3] Alii multi non credebant, sed, timentes gladium, dicebant tantum ore se esse Sarracenos. Sed et⁴ ipsum patrum Machometi adduxerunt ut esset {242v} Sarracenus, qui ait, “quidnam erit si hoc non facero, O fili fratris?” Dixit Machometus, “interfitiam te,

¹ *post sumus add. neque deliberauimus P²*

² *ex] de P²*

³ *interficiantur P²*

⁴ *Sed et] Quin etiam P²*

prophecy. And they said to him, "Make us find the truth of those things which you say so that we may follow you, for God does not send a prophet without some preceding sure sign." Muḥammad said to them, "God said to me, 'I have already chosen prophets before you and they took them for liars, and I fear sending you with clear signs lest they reproach you as a liar just as those sent before you, and therefore I have sent you with a sword;'"¹ as it is said in the Qur'ān in the Chapter of the Children of Israel:² *We have not prohibited <Ourselves> from sending you with portents except because untruth was attributed to those <prophets> sent previously* (17:59)³ who nevertheless had perception. And the faithful were known in this way; they did not worry even if they were killed.⁴

4.3] Many others did not believe, but, fearing the sword, they said that they were Muslims only with the mouth.⁵ Indeed they brought forth the paternal uncle⁶ himself of Muḥammad so that he would be a Muslim, and he said, "What will happen if I do not do this, O son of <my> brother?" Muḥammad said, "I will kill

meaning would make more sense in this context.

¹ These sentences form an introduction to verse 17:59 which the author is about to cite; and, in fact, the circumstances related here—except the phrase "I have sent you now with the sword"—resemble those related in several ḥadīths used to explain the circumstances in which verse 17:59 was revealed; see al-Ṭūsī (on 17:59; 6, pp. 492-93) and al-Zamakhsharī (on 17:59; 2, p. 674) who both hold that those asking here for miracles were members of Quraysh.

² Sūrah 17 also is known as *Sūrah al-Isrā'*, the Sūrah of the Night Journey.

³ This verse probably lacked vowel pointing (which Qur'ānic Arabic normally has) in the Arabic version of this work, and this caused the Latin translators to misread it. As it is pointed in the Qur'ān the first part of the verse reads *mā mana'anā an* ("Nothing has prevented us from . . .") But without pointing it could easily be read as the translators did: *mā mana'nā an* ("We have not prohibited ourselves from. . .").

⁴ This last sentence is rather difficult to make sense of. Are "the faithful" Muslims? or are they Christians or Jews living at the time of the Prophet? In what way were they made known by the previous events? This series of unanswered questions suggests that there may be a lacuna in the text here.

⁵ I. e., they said it with their mouths but did not believe it with their hearts.

⁶ I. e., Ḥamzah ibn 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib the paternal uncle of the Prophet who became a loyal Muslim and later the hero of many legends; see EI² 3:152-54.

O patruē.” Qui dixit, “nec aliud poterit esse, O fili fratris?” “Non,” inquit. Et ait, “sequar te super¹ quo uolueris, lingua tantum, non corde, et hoc timore gladii.” Omar etiam filius Catheb Maadi,² cum compelleretur ait, “Domine tu nosti quia non effitior Sarracenus nisi timore gladii.” Etiam filius Ebi Hastaa³ timore gladii factus est Sarracenus; vnde litteras misit ad Mesques quas mulier abscondebatur inter capillos capitis sui, nuntians eis aduentum Machometi ut cauerent uiolentiam doctrinae eius.

4.4] Violentiae etiam addita est seductio quasi diuini responsi. Cum sederet aliquando Machometus in stipitatione sotiorum suorum et quaereret quaerens de aliqua quaestione, dicebat, “Non habeo inde scientiam, sed nunc ueniet ad me Gabriel qui quaestioni tuae respondebit.” Sedebat autem sic per horam cogitans. Cumque veniret ei responsio, cadebat in fatiem suam et retorquebat manus et pedes, et sic uidebant eum donec caput leuaret, dicebatque, “Ubinam est quaerens? Venit,” ait, “mihi responsio tuae quaestionis per Gabrielem, et est talis et talis.”

¹ semper *P*²

² Homar filius Catheb Maadi *M*

³ filius Eby Hastaa *M*

you, O paternal uncle.” He said, “Nothing else can happen, O son of <my> brother?” “No,” he said. And <his uncle> said, “I will follow you whither you desire with the tongue only, not the heart, and this because of fear of the sword.” Likewise when Omar son of Catheb Maadi¹ was compelled, he said, “Lord you know that I do not become a Muslim except by fear of the sword.”² Again the son of Ebi Hastaa³ became a Muslim by fear of the sword, on account of which he sent letters to Mecca which a woman hid in the hair of her head, informing them of the coming of Muḥammad so that they would be wary of the violence of his teaching.

4.4] Now to <the> violence <of his message> was added the seduction of supposedly divine advice. When Muḥammad was sitting once in the crowd of his companions, and a questioner asked about some matter, he said, “I do not have knowledge regarding that, but now Gabriel who will respond to your question will come to me.” He sat thus for an hour thinking. And when an answer came to him, he fell on his face and twisted his hands and feet, and thus they saw him until he raised his head and said, “Where is the questioner? An answer,” he said, “to your question came to me through Gabriel, and it is such and such.”⁴

¹ I. e., ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb, (d. 644) a Companion of the Prophet and second caliph. The otherwise unexplainable word *Maadi* added to his name here may be a corruption of *min ‘Adī* (= “from ‘Adī”) since ‘Umar came from the Quraysh clan of ‘Adī.

² These two anecdotes are clearly of Christian fabrication, though they have a distant connection with the famous conversion stories of Ḥamzah and ‘Umar. See e.g. Ibn Ishāq, pp. 184-85, 224-230. Ramon Lull, who, as I have argued elsewhere, apparently knew *Liber denudationis*, has a very similar account of the supposedly forced conversion of Ḥamzah in a work written in 1308; see his *Disputatio Raymundi christiani et Hamar saraceni* 2. 1. 7, p. 467a; cf. T. Burman, “The Influence of the *Apology of al-Kindī*,” *passim*.

³ I have not been able to identify this person or the story told about him in the following lines.

⁴ This anecdote, told in order to illustrate that the prophet went into epileptic-like trances when he received inspiration, is based very closely on a ḥadīth recorded by al-Bukhārī in which the Prophet is asked about the legality of certain dressing habits during the ḥajj. The Christian author, of course, has Muḥammad experiencing far more serious contortions than does the ḥadīth. See al-Bukhārī, 66. 2. 2.

4.5] “Retulit mihi pro certo Ahmed et Elhossen, qui dixit, retulit nobis Mahe de Nase de filio Omar, qui dixit, audiui Aiesse filiam scilicet Machometi dicentem, quaesiui a patre meo quomodo ve/niret {243r} ei uisio, qui respondet, ‘O Filia, sicut sonitus campanae, et cum uenerit non contineo quin cadam in fatiem, recedetque a me; in die frigido etiam profusu¹ sudore remaneo.’”

4.6] Dixit autem se ascendisse usque ad septem caelos, inter quos erat distantia iter quingentorum annorum; dixitque quod uidit angelum quendam de angelis maiorem² magnitudine mundi multis mille uicibus. “Qui etiam uenit ad me,” ait, “prouolutus genibus, flens largiter, adeo ut lachrimae eius currerent ex oculis eius, instar Farsar³ et Nili fluminum, et dixit, ‘O Machomete, veniam mihi⁴ pete.’ Et dixi ei, ‘nunquid tu es tu?’ et ‘quid mihi esse poterit cum creauit Dominus tuus infernum?’” Et⁵ transibat per

¹ perfuso *P*²

² maiorem *P*²] magnum *P*; cf. 4.7 (sint mundo maiores multis) *infra*.

³ Pharsar *P*²

⁴ mihi] pro mihi *P*²

⁵ Et] Inde *P*²

4.5] “Ahmed and Elhossen related to me with certainty, who said, Mahe told us on the authority of¹ Nase on the authority of the son of Omar, who said, I heard Aiesse,² the daughter, that is, of Muḥammad saying, I asked my father how a vision came to him, and he responded, ‘O daughter, just like the sound of a bell, and when it comes I cannot keep from falling on <my> face, and then it will withdraw from me; even on a cold day I remain in a profuse sweat.’”³

4.6] He⁴ furthermore said that he had ascended all the way up through the seven heavens, between <each of> which was a journey of five hundred years,⁵ and he said that he saw a certain one of the angels greater than the magnitude of the world by many thousand times. “He⁶ even came up to me,” he said, “cast down on his knees, crying abundantly, to such an extent that his tears were running from his eyes like the floods of the *Farsar*⁷ and the Nile, and he said, ‘O Muḥammad, seek a pardon for me.’ And I said to him: ‘Are you you?’ and ‘what could be forthcoming on my account when your Lord created the netherworld?’”⁸ And he

¹ “on the authority of” translates the Latin *de* (=“from,” “about”) which itself appears to be a translation of the Arabic *‘an* (=“from,” “according to”). This preposition appears frequently in *isnāds* with the technical meaning of “on the authority of.”

² I. e., ‘Ā’ishah bint Abī Bakr, who was not, as mentioned here, Muḥammad’s daughter, but his wife, as indicated below in 7.2.

³ I have not found this ḥadīth with this *isnād*, but all the particulars reported here can be found in a series of four shorter ḥadīths recorded in Muslim 43 (*faḍa’il*); 15, p. 88-89. Once again the Christian author exaggerates Muḥammad’s physical reactions to inspiration with a view to making them appear the result of sickness or possession.

⁴ Muḥammad is the subject.

⁵ A number of ḥadīths report that there is a journey (*masīrah*) of 500 years between each heaven; cf. Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Qurṭubī on 2:255; 3, p. 276.

⁶ I. e., the angel.

⁷ *Farsar* is probably a corruption of the Arabic name for the Euphrates, *al-Furāt*, which is a likely choice for pairing with the Nile in any case; more to the point, the pair are explicitly mentioned in a similar context in ḥadīths which concern Muḥammad’s night journey; see al-Bukhārī, 59. 6. 1, and Muslim 1 (Imān); 2, p. 224.

⁸ The sense of this strange statement is perhaps as follows: “Why would almighty God who created all things—even hell—accede to the prayers of a mortal like me rather than an angel like you?”

cohortes angelorum et rogabat pro eis duas fatiendo flexiones, et petebat¹ eis veniam orando pro eis.

4.7] O praesumptio indicibilis, et mendatia impunita! Quomodo poterat interesse tantis in caelo splendoribus, qui nec unius angeli aduentum poterat sustinere, quin se epilepticum² fingeret—aut forsitam uenerat.³ O fortissima ueritas qua statim deprehenditur falsitas illorum qui super omnia⁴ mentiri conantur! Nunquid⁵ tanta corporali magnitudine ut sint mundo maiores multis mille uicibus circumscribibiliter angeli diffunduntur? Iterum si boni erant angeli quomodo optimi⁶ venia indigebant? Si mali erant, quomodo in tanta caelorum celsitudine remanebant? Denique {243v} bonum elegerant intercessorem luxuriosissimum impostorem atque pseudopropheta cuius praesumptio erat tam intolerabilis ut qui discipulis certitudinem de sua prophetia dare non poterat intercedere se pro summis angelis iactitabat.⁷

¹ *post* petebant *add.* pro *P*²

² epilepticum *P*²

³ uenerat] erat *P*²

⁴ omnibus *P*²

⁵ *post* Nunquid *add.* angeli *P*²

⁶ optimi *P*²: opprimi *P*

⁷ iactitabat *P*²: iactitabant *P*

passed through companies of angels and prayed for them doing two bendings,¹ and he sought for them a pardon by praying on behalf of them.²

4.7] O unspeakable presumption and unrestrained lies! How could he who was not able to bear the coming of one angel without describing himself as if he were an epileptic—or perhaps <epilepsy> did come <over him>—take part in so many marvelous things in heaven? O strongest truth by which the falsity of those who try to lie about all things is immediately detected! Are angels spread out in such great bodily magnitude that they are many thousand times greater than the world in circumference? Again, if the angels were good, how did the best need any pardon? If they were evil, how did they remain in such great loftiness of heaven? In short, they had chosen as a good intercessor the most licentious impostor and pseudo-prophet, whose presumption was so intolerable that he who was not able to give any sure sign of his prophethood³ to his disciples boasted that he had interceded on behalf of the highest angels.

¹ The Latin *flexio*, which I have translated “bending,” almost certainly translates the Arabic *rakʿah*, the ritual bending of the torso followed by two prostrations done by Muslims in prayer.

² On Muḥammad’s night journey see below, ch. 12.1-8 where the subject is taken up again at great length.

³ I. e., was not able to refer to any earlier prophecies regarding himself.

QUINTUM CAPITULUM.¹ DE
DOCTORIBUS MACHOMETI

5.1] Adhaesit autem Machometo monachus quidam dictus Boheira, et ipse² primus qui adhaesit ei, et factus est ei doctor et promouit eum in lectura librorum; notificauitque ei quid eueniret ei de fa[c]to suo, praesumpsitque ut baiulus fieret sui status post eum; fuitque cum Machometo pene vsque ad mortem Machometi, ferturque³ quod interfecerit eum et Finecs⁴ Iudaeum nocte una in lectis suis.

5.2] Adhaeseruntque ei Salon Persa et Abdalla filius Selam Iudeus, et facti sunt Sarraceni. Quidam autem Eboiogeel de Edesa, et Rebia⁵ filius Rabie dixerunt Machometo quod ille Persa et ille Hebraeus docebant eum, et ecce cecidit in fatiem suam, et contractae sunt manus eius et pedes et uenerunt sotii eius ad eum et cohoperiunt eum vestibus suis. Et ad se rediens dixit, “Deus

¹ Quintum capitulum *post* de doctoribus Machometi *infra transp.* P²

² ipse] est P²

³ ferturque] fertur vero P²

⁴ Finecs M: Phinecs P²

⁵ Febia P: Phebia P²

THE FIFTH CHAPTER. ON THE
TEACHERS OF MUḤAMMAD

5.1] Now a certain monk called Boheira¹ was a follower of Muḥammad, and he was the first one who followed him, and he became his teacher and encouraged him in the reading of books. And he informed him of what would happen to him in regard to his destiny, and he assumed that he would become the carrier of his public authority after him. And he was with Muḥammad almost until the death of Muḥammad, and it is reported that he killed him and Finecs the Jew² one night in their beds.

5.2] And Salon the Persian³ and Abdalla the Jew son of Selam⁴ were followers of him <too>, and they became Muslims. But a certain Eboiogeel of Edesa and Rebia son of Rabie⁵ said to Muḥammad that that Persian and that Jew taught him, and, behold, he fell on his face, and his hands and feet contracted, and his companions came to him and covered him with their clothes. And coming back to himself he said, "God ordered me to

¹ I. e., Baḥīrā, the Christian monk of Islamic tradition whom the young Muḥammad was said to have met in Syria (see e. g. Ibn Ishāq, pp. 115-18, al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rikh al-rusul wa-al-mulūk*, series 1, vol. 3, pp. 1123-25 and al-Qurṭubī, pp. 285-87). A great deal is made of this story in the Christian polemical literature against Islam where he (often under the name of Sergius, as in the *Risālat al-Kindī*, pp. 128ff.) is portrayed as a Christian schismatic or heretic responsible for providing Muḥammad with his unorthodox knowledge of the Bible. See N. Daniel, *Islam and the West*, pp. 4-5, 88-89, 235-37. I have not been able to trace the exact source of the information about Baḥīrā given in the following lines.

² I. e., Finḥās ibn Hisham, the unbelieving Jew mentioned in Ibn Ishāq, pp. 388-89; cf. J.-M. Mérigoux, "L'ouvrage d'un frère prêcheur," p. 118, note 10.

³ I. e., Salmān al-Fārisī the famous Persian convert contemporary to the Prophet mentioned by Ibn Ishāq, pp. 136-143 (cf. al-Qurṭubī, pp. 289-90, 318).

⁴ I. e., 'Abd Allāh ibn Salām (d. 663-4) a learned Rabbi from among the Median Jews who converted to Islam (cf. al-Qurṭubī, pp. 318, 346, and EI² 1:52).

⁵ I have not been able to identify either Eboiogeel (= Abū Ḥujayl?) of Edesa or Rebia son of Rabie (probably = Rabī'ah ibn Rābi'ah). See next note but one however.

misit me corripere uos de sermone quem dixistis quod tales me docerent;" legitque eis sententiam unam {244r} quae est in fine lectionis *Elnahel*, quod interpretatur "palma," quae sic dicit: *Scimus quod ipsi dicent quod*¹ *instrueret eum homo. Lingua autem qua loquuntur ei Persica; haec autem Arabica patens est.* Et ex hoc² dixit, "Quomodo potest esse quod illi me instruant quorum unus Persicus est, alter Hebraeus?" Qui respondebat ei, "Potest esse quod lingua sua tibi loquuntur et exponunt. Tu lingua tua ornes et rectifies." Nec inuenit eis responsionem.

¹ quod *MP*² et sic *Alchoranus* (anna): cum *P*

² ex hoc] deinde *P*²

reproach you for the statement which you uttered, that such men taught me.” And he read to them one verse which is at the end of the reading of *Elhanel*, which is translated “the Palm,”¹ and it says thus: *We know that these will say that a man instructed him. The language in which they speak to him is Persian, but this is clear Arabic* (16:103).² And after this he said, “How can it be that they instruct me, one of whom is a Persian, the other a Hebrew?” He³ responded to him, “It is possible that they speak and explain to you in their language. You will embellish and correct in your language.” He found no answer for them.⁴

¹ The reference here is to *Sūrat al-Naḥl* which actually means “the Sūrah (16) of the Bee;” the translators have said that it means “the palm” because they misread *al-naḥl*, “the bee” as *al-nakhl*, the palm”: the two words are almost identical in Arabic script; cf. J.-M. Mérigoux, “L’ouvrage d’un frère prêcheur,” p. 86, note 28.

² A number of ḥadīths record circumstances very like this as the occasion for the revelation of 16:105. Salmān al-Fārisī is often mentioned in ḥadīths as one of those who were supposed to have taught Muḥammad, but ‘Abd Allāh ibn Salām is not, so far as I know; nor are the names of those who *accused* Muḥammad of learning from Persians and Jews normally supplied in the Traditional sources as they are here. See esp. al-Ṭabarī on 16:103; 14, pp. 177-80, esp. p. 179; cf. al-Ṭūsī on 16:103; 6, p. 427; al-Zamakhsharī on 16:103; 2, p. 635; and Ibn Kathīr on 16:103; 2, p. 910.

³ I. e., either Eboiogeel or Rebia mentioned just above.

⁴ These further details (beginning with “And after this . . .”) tacked on to the previous ḥadīth are of an origin unknown to me. Riccoldo’s *Itinerarium* 35.28-31, pp. 140-41 contains an abbreviated version of the contents of this chapter.

SEXTUM CAPITULUM.¹ DE DISCIPULIS MACHOMETI
E DISCORDI INSTITUTIONE ALCHORANI.

6.1] Item narratur in eorum historiis dixisse Machometum, “descendit Alchoranus super me in septem litteris,² et quicquid satis est sufficit.”³ Dicunt⁴ hos⁵ fuisse Nafe⁶ et Ebou⁷ Omar et Homra⁸ et⁹ Elkessar et Asser et filius¹⁰ Ketir¹¹ et filius¹² Amer. Dicimus ergo eis, istine legerunt umquam coram Machometo? Et dicent quod non, sed hii coram senioribus, et seniores coram aliis senioribus et usque ad Machometum.

6.2] Tunc quaerimus, nunquid isti concordauerunt cum senioribus prioribus in lectura quam nunc tenetis? Probamus quod non, quia lectura primae partis contraria est parti secundae quia de¹³ tempore Machometi nullus sciuit Alchoranum {244v} nisi Abdalla filius Messoud et Zeid filius Thabet¹⁴ et Othman¹⁵ filius Offan¹⁶ et Ebi filius Chab. De Ali filio¹⁷ Abitaleb quidam dixerunt sciuisse perfecte,¹⁸ quidam non. Quilibet autem istorum statuit sibi

¹ Sextum capitulum *post* discordi institutione Alchorani *infra transp.* P²

² litteris] uiris M

³ *sic etiam M:* sufficere P²

⁴ dicunt M: dictatum P

⁵ hunc P²

⁶ Naphe P²

⁷ Ebon P

⁸ Homra M: Honira P

⁹ et M: *om.* P

¹⁰ *sic etiam M:* filiis P²

¹¹ Ketiz P: Kecir M; *vid. com.*

¹² *sic etiam M:* filiis P²

¹³ quia de] namque P²

¹⁴ Thabet M: Tabet P

¹⁵ Ochman P

¹⁶ Offam P

¹⁷ *sic etiam M:* filii P²

¹⁸ partem M

THE SIXTH CHAPTER. ON THE DISCIPLES OF MUḤAMMAD
AND THE DISCORDANT ESTABLISHMENT
OF THE <TEXT OF THE> QUR'ĀN

6.1] Likewise,¹ it is narrated in their histories that Muḥammad said, “the Qur’ān descended on me in seven letters,² and whatever is enough is sufficient.” They say that <the possessors of these> were Nafe and Ebou Omar and Homra and Elkessar and Asser and the son of Ketir and the son of Amer.³ We say to them, therefore, did these men ever recite <the Qur’ān> in the presence of Muḥammad? And they will say that <they did> not, but they <recited it> in the presence of elders, and the elders in the presence of other elders all the way back to Muḥammad.

6.2] We ask then, did these men agree with earlier elders in the text which you now have? We will prove that <they did> not, because the text of the first part is contrary to the second part, since in the time of Muḥammad none knew the Qur’ān except Abdalla son of Messoud and Zeid son of Thabet and Othman son of Offan and Ebi son of Chab. Some said about Ali son of Abitaleb⁴ that he knew it perfectly, some <say that he did> not.

¹ In paragraphs 6.1 through 6.3 the author sets out his polemical view of the textual history of the Qur’ān. While differing throughout in detail, its general thrust is the same as a longer account of the same events in the *Apology*; see *Risālat al-Kindī*, pp. 128-41.

² The Latin of this phrase is a verbatim translation of a well-known and widespread ḥadīth, *litteris* translating *ahruf*, which means “(articulated) sounds” and “letters (of the alphabet)” among other things, but whose exact meaning here is unclear. It is traditionally taken to refer to the seven accepted sets of readings of the Qur’ān. See next note and al-Ṭabarī, “*Khuṭbat al-kitāb*”; 1, pp. 11-12 and ff. where many versions of this ḥadīth are listed. It is far from clear, however, what the following clause means.

³ These are the names, in more or less garbled form, of the seven early Muslims whose readings of the Qur’ān were deemed authentic by Ibn Mujāhid in accordance with the tradition that Muḥammad himself had been taught the Qur’ān in seven sets of readings (see previous note): Nāfi^c, Abū ‘Amr, Ḥamzah, al-Kisā’ī, ‘Āsim, Ibn Kathīr, and Ibn ‘Āmir. See W. Watt, *Bell’s Introduction to the Qur’ān*, pp. 48-49.

⁴ Those men mentioned in the preceding sentence are all early Muslims involved in various ways in the compilation of the written Qur’ān: ‘Abd Allāh ibn

Alchoranum aliorum Alchorano dissimilem, et pugnaverunt contra se inuicem, non recipientes quae aliorum erant <vera> usque ad mortem. Et post mortem illorum¹ populi discordauerunt in Alchorano usque ad tempus Mereban filii Elhekem² qui composuit eis hunc Alchoranum quem nunc habent in manibus, et combussit alios Alchoranos. Et tunc etiam septem dicti³ prefecti⁴ ei in tantum contradixerunt sibi in gramatica et idiomatibus propriis.⁵

6.3] In ueris autem historiis inuenimus quod Capitulum Repudiationis excellebat Capitulum Vaccae quod primum erat in ducentis et triginta sentiis quod hodie constat tantum ex duodecim. Dicunt etiam quod Capitulum Vaccae mille continebat sententias et hodie tantum⁶ ducentas septuaginta⁷ quoque. Referunt etiam de quodam potente, nomine Elagag, quod detraxit⁸ ab Alchorano octuaginta quinque sententias, et alias totidem alterius sensus addiderit. Quomodo ergo verum est quod dixit de Alchorano Deus—ut aiunt—: *Quoniam nos descendere fecimus recordationem et nos eam custodientes erimus*. Narrant etiam quaedam historiae quod Machometus mortuus est, nec habuit populus {245r} Alchoranum. Cum autem Eboubeker susciperet

¹ Et post mortem illorum] Post illorum mortem P²

² Merebam filii Elhekem M: Meteban filii Eleken P; vid. com.

³ post dicti add. ciuitatum M

⁴ prefecti PM: perfecti P²

⁵ Et tunc. . . propriis.] Tunc vero septem dicti perfecti, ei tantum contradixerunt in gramatica et idiomatibus propriis P²

⁶ post tantum add. et hodie P et haec verba exp. et habet add. P²

⁷ octaginta P²

⁸ detraxerit P²

But each of these established a Qur'ān for himself which was different from the Qur'ān of the others, and they fought each other, not accepting which of the others were <genuine> until death. And after the death of these men the people disagreed about the Qur'ān until the time of Mereban son of Elhekem¹ who composed for them this Qur'ān which they now have in hand, and he burned the other Qur'āns. And even then the seven just-mentioned overseers over <the Qur'ān> disagreed with each other greatly in grammar and in their own languages.²

6.3] We find in authentic accounts that the Chapter of Repudiation,³ which originally had two hundred and thirty verses but which today consists of only twelve, <originally> surpassed the Chapter of the Cow <in length>. They say also that the Chapter of the Cow⁴ contained a thousand verses and today only two hundred seventy. They relate about a certain powerful man named Elagag⁵ that he removed from the Qur'ān eighty-five verses and added others with a totally different meaning.⁶ How therefore is it true what God said in the Qur'ān—as they contend—: *That we*

Mas'ūd (d. 635), Zayd ibn Thābit (d. 666), 'Uthmān ibn 'Affān (d. 656), Ubayy ibn Ka'b (?) (cf. J.-M. Mérigoux, "L'ouvrage d'un frère prêcheur," p. 119, note 21), and 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib (d. 661). See W. Watt, *Bell's Introduction to the Qur'ān*, pp. 40-49.

¹ I. e., Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam (d. 685), the fourth Umayyad Caliph and previously secretary to 'Uthmān; he helped in the recension of the canonical Qur'ān. See EI² 6:621-23; cf. J.-M. Mérigoux, "L'ouvrage d'un frère Prêcheur," p. 119, note 23.

² The textual history of the Qur'ān outlined in this paragraph is rather distorted at points for polemical effect, but it is recognizably based on the traditional history of the text as found, for example, in al-Ṭabarī, "Khuṭbat al-kitāb," 1, pp. 25ff; and cf. W. Watt, *Bell's Introduction to the Qur'ān*, pp. 40-50.

³ The Latin *Capitulum Repudiationis* here translates the Arabic *Sūrat al-Taḥrīm*, the Sūrah (66) of Prohibition, which has twelve verses as the author indicates.

⁴ I. e., *Sūrat al-Baqarah*, the Sūrah (2) of the Cow.

⁵ I. e., al-Ḥajjāj, the Umayyad amīr mentioned in 11.1.

⁶ For parallels to these claims that various people altered the Qur'ān, see the *Apology* which likewise mentions sūrahs (though not those mentioned here) which had been changed, and also discusses al-Ḥajjāj's role in this process (*Risālat al-Kindī*, pp. 131-32, 137).

principatum, praecepit quod quilibet repeteret quae posset, et¹ hunc qui est prae manibus composuit Alchoranum. Reliquos autem combussit.²

6.4] Sed et in Capitulo *Elamran*³ de Alchorano dicit, *Nullus nouit eius expositionem praeter Deum. Et fundati in scientia dicunt, 'credidimus ei; totus*⁴ *enim est a domino nostro'*; etiam reuera in hoc libro sunt multa tam obscura, tam truncata, ita ut nullum sensum facientia, fatuitatem potius et mendatia palliarent.⁵ Si enim, ut dicit, solus Deus expositionem nouit, igitur nec Machometus.⁶ Stolidus fuit nuncius de penitus ignoratis. Aut si ei notificata sunt, quare ipse aliqua non tradidit expositionem?

¹ et exp. *P*²

² combussit *P*²: concludit *P* (vid. com.)

³ *Elamran MP*²: *Elamera P*

⁴ totus *P*² et sic *Alchoranus* (kullun): totu *P*

⁵ palliarent] praetendant *P*^{2a}: obtendant *P*^{2b}

⁶ post Machometus add. atque sic *P*²

*made a recollection*¹ *descend and we will be the protector of it* (15:9). Furthermore certain accounts relate that Muḥammad was <already> dead and the people <still> did not have the Qur'ān. When, however, Eboubeker² assumed sovereignty he ordered that each one should repeat those things which he was able, and he composed this Qur'ān which is now in <our> hands. The rest, however, he burned.³

6.4] But indeed in the Chapter of *Elamran*⁴ he says about the Qur'ān, *None know the interpretation of it except God. And those well-grounded in knowledge say, "we have believed in it, for all of it is from our Lord"* (3:7); and in truth in this book there are many things so obscure, so mangled, that, while making no sense, they rather conceal foolishness and lies. Now if, as he says, God alone knows the interpretation, therefore Muḥammad does not. He was a rude messenger of things thoroughly unknown <to him>. Or if they were made known to him, why did he not pass on an interpretation somewhere?

¹ The Latin *recordatio* ("recollection," "remembrance,") translates the Qur'ān's *dhikr* ("recollection," "remembrance", "narration", etc.) which refers here to the Qur'ān.

² I. e., Abū Bakr, the first Caliph (632-34).

³ The author has here conflated two different events in the traditional history of the Qur'ān. It was said that Abū Bakr ordered Zayd ibn Thābit to make a collection of as much of the Qur'ān as he could find from whomever knew any of it. Later, when this proved insufficient, Uthmān again commissioned Zayd to compile an authoritative text, after which he burned all extant previous codices. See W. Watt, *Bell's Introduction to the Qur'ān*, pp. 40-44.

⁴ I. e., *Sūrat Āl 'Imrān*, the Sūrah (3) of the Family of 'Imrān.

SEPTIMUM CAPITULUM.¹ QUOD DE IMMUNDITIIS
IN PARTE, PARTIM UERO DE UERBIS ALIORUM
QUAE SIBI DICTA² COMPOSITUS
ALCHORANUS

7.1] Item in Capitulo *Eltahrim* quod interpretatur “vetatio” siue “anathema:” *O propheta, quare anathematizas seu vetas quae Deus concessit ad quid quaeris, facere voluntatem uxorum tuarum? Et Deus est propitius et misericors. Iam posuit legem uobis Deus {245v} ut soluatis iuramenta uestra.*

7.2] Expositio autem binus sententiae est quod Machometus diligebat quandam dictam Mariam Iacobitam quam presentauerat ei³ Macouques⁴ Rex Iacobitarum. Duae autem de uxoribus⁵ Machometo—una scilicet dicta Aiesse filia Ebibeker nobilissima inter eos, et Hafsa⁶ filia Omar—moueabantur zelotipia; quae⁷ cum die quadam intrarent ad eum, inuenerunt dictum Machometum cognoscentem⁸ dictam Mariam, et dixerunt ei, “decetne sic facere?” Qui erubuit et iurauit se nunquam de caetero cogniturum eam, sicque quieuerunt ad iuramentum eius. Cumque modicum temporis pertransisset non potuit se continere ab ea, et dixit, “descendere fecit Dominus super me pro Maria,” dicens, *O*

¹ Septimum capitulum *post* dicta compositus Alchoranus *infra transp.* P²

² dicta P²: *deest* P

³ presentauerat ei] obtulerat P²

⁴ Macouques M: Macoquex P

⁵ de uxoribus] fuerunt P²

⁶ Haffa P: Haassa M (*vid. com.*)

⁷ mouebantur zelotipia; quae] Mouebantur autem zelotipia ac P²

⁸ concubentem M

THE SEVENTH CHAPTER. THAT THE QUR'ĀN
WAS IN PART COMPOSED OF UNCLEAN THINGS
BUT PARTLY OF THE WORDS OF OTHERS
WHICH WERE SPOKEN TO HIM

7.1] Likewise in the chapter *Eltahrim*,¹ which means “the Prohibition” or “the Anathema”: *O prophet, why do you anathematize or prohibit those things which God has conceded regarding that which you seek, <that is>, to do the will of your wives? God is well-disposed and merciful. God has already laid down a law for you so that you may break your oaths (66:1-2).*

7.2] Now the interpretation of these two verses is that Muḥammad loved a certain woman called Maria the Jacobite whom Macouques the King of the Jacobites² had presented to him. But two of the wives belonging to Muḥammad—one, that is, the previously-mentioned Aiesse daughter of Ebibeker,³ the most noble among them, and Hafsa daughter of Omar⁴—were moved by jealousy. When they went to him one day, they found the just-mentioned Muḥammad having sex with the just-mentioned Maria, and they said to him, “Is it seemly to act thus?” He blushed and swore that he would never have sex with her again, and so they refrained from action in consequence of his oath. And when a small amount of time had passed, he was not able to restrain himself from her, and he said, “the Lord made <this verse> descend upon me in regard to Mary,” saying, *O prophet why do you*

¹ I. e., *Sūrat al-Ṭahrim*, the Sūrah (66) of Prohibition.

² I. e., al-Muqawqis who was traditionally said to be the master of Egypt at the time of its conquest by the Arabs and to have given a slave Māriyah to Muḥammad. See al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rikh al-rusul wa-al-mulūk*, series 1, vol. 3, p. 1561; and Ibn Sa'd, *al-Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā* 8, p. 212. Māriyah is frequently identified as *al-qubṭiyah* (the Copt) in the early sources and al-Muqawqis was referred to *inter alia* as the “master of the Copts”. These epithets were responsible for the translators referring to both as Jacobites.

³ I. e., 'Ā'ishah bint Abī Bakr, one of Muḥammad's wives, mentioned above in 4.5.

⁴ I. e., Ḥafṣah bint 'Umar, another of Muḥammad's wives.

propheta, quid¹ uetas quod Deus concessit? Placare vxores tuas expostulas—illas scilicet predictas²—. Iam legem uobis posuit Deus ut soluat³ iuramenta uestra. Sicque peierauit et iterum cognouit illam. Vide quantam impietatem statuit propter hoc ut quasi licenter adulteraret.

7.3] Iterum in Capitulo *Elmaiede*, quod dicitur “mensa,” ubi dicit: *Non imputabit uobis Deus fraudationem iuramenti uestri, sed moderationem eius. Pro transgressione uero erit decem miserorum cibatio, seu eorundem uestitio, aut unius captiui redemptio. Qui autem hoc non ualet³ tribus uicibus ieiunabit.*

7.4] Infra dixitque⁴ illi vna de uxoribus, “O Machomete, Deus festinauit in tuo desiderio.” Voluit per hoc dicere, “forsitan Deus

¹ *sic etiam M*

² *illas scilicet predictas om. M*

³ *potest P²*

⁴ *Infra dixitque] Deinde dixit P²*

prohibit what God has allowed? You seek¹ to please your wives—those, that is, just mentioned—. God has set down a law for you that you may break your oaths (66:1-2).² And thus he perjured himself and had sex with that woman again. See how much impiety he officially established on account of this in order that he might commit adultery freely.

7.3] Again in the Chapter of *Elmaiede*,³ which means “the Table”, where he says: *God will not hold you to account for the deceit of your oath, but rather for its moderation.⁴ But for any transgression the feeding of ten wretches will be <required>, or the clothing of them, or the redemption of one captive. But whoever cannot do this will fast three times (5:89).⁵*

7.4] And later one of <his> wives said to this man, “O Muḥammad, God hastened in your desire.”⁶ By this she meant to

¹ The Arabic verb which *expostulo* translates here is *BGhY VIII* which means “to seek” or “to desire”; *expostulo*, which usually means “to demand urgently” or “to require,” appears to be used with the meaning of that Arabic verb.

² This paragraph is intended to explain the shocking reasons (at least to medieval Christian eyes) for which the verses just cited from Sūrah 66 were revealed. This narrative is based closely on one of the normal explanations of the circumstances of this revelation as set out in the commentaries and ḥadīth collections. See e. g. al-Ṭabarī on 66:1; 28, pp. 155-57; and Ibn Sa’d, *al-Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā* 8, pp. 212-13. Cf. *Quadruplex reprobatio* fol. 153rb-va, and Riccoldo’s *Itinerarium* 35.23-24, p. 140 where the same events are recounted for the same reason.

³ *Sūrat al-Mā’idah*, the Sūrah (5) of the Table.

⁴ It is not entirely clear what the translators meant by this sentence. The Qur’anic Arabic might best be translated as follows: “God will not take you to task for what is unintentional in your oath, but rather He will take you to task for the oath which you swear in earnest.”

⁵ This verse is cited almost parenthetically as a further example of how Muḥammad and his followers supposedly believe that God allows them to break promises if they so choose. N. b. that the first sentence of the Latin version has rather distorted the meaning of the verse. The *Quadruplex reprobatio* cites it in the same context, fols. 154vb-155ra.

⁶ ‘Ā’ishah is recorded saying almost exactly these words in a ḥadīth recorded in al-Bukhārī (65, Sūrah 33, bab 7. 1) and in al-Ṭabarī (on 33:51; 22, p. 26), in order to help interpret verse 33:51 which our author cites just below in 7.7. I have found no source for the other comments attributed to one of the wives in the rest of this paragraph.

in caelo suo te {246r} apropiavit incestui.” Et addidit, “nunquid Deus ipse praecepit tibi huiusmodi facere? Cum etiam [hoc¹] in teipso haec verbo tenus detesteris, forsitan quaerit Deus placare te per huiusmodi et apropiquare tibi.”

7.5] Ipse vero duabus vxoribus² totum legit³ quod sequitur in Capitulo Vetationis: *Paenitemini coram Deo quia declinauerunt corda uestra*, quasi dicat de hoc quod calumniatae sunt eum⁴ de incestu; sequiturque⁵ continuo:⁶ [si⁷] forte Deus, si⁸ uos repudiauerit, det ei pro vobis vxores meliores uobis—sarracenas, credentes, locupletes, paenitentes, adorantes, laudantes, agiles ac virgines. Quod audientes, dixerunt, “paenitemus.”

7.6] Devenit etiam ad me, per historiam de cuius veritate non dubitant, quod praedicta Aiesse intrauit ad eum, repperitque eum solum cum muliere; parumque secedens rediit, muliere non inuenta. Cui dixit Machometus, “Haec mulier,” inquit, “erat Sanitas quae venit ad me rogare vt ei a Deo postularem sanitatem.” Nec respondit ei Aiesse prae timore. Intellige fictionem adulteri quae nec habet colorem.

¹ hoc om. M

² post uxoribus add. semper vsus P²

³ sic etiam M: lege P²

⁴ eum M: cum P

⁵ -que M: quod P

⁶ sequiturque continuo] immediate P²

⁷ si PM, sed deest in Alchorano (asá rabbuhu in tallaqakunna . . .)

⁸ si exp. P²

say, "perhaps God in His heaven draws near to you in unchastity." And she added, "Did God Himself order you to do this? Since you detested these things in yourself as far as the meaning of the words goes, perhaps God seeks to please you through this and to draw close to you."

7.5] But he¹ recited to two <of his> wives all of what follows in the Chapter of Prohibition:² *Do penance before God since your hearts have turned aside* (66:4), as if he should say about this that they falsely accused him of unchastity; and immediately this follows: *perhaps God, if he³ repudiates you, will give to him in your place wives better than you—Muslim, believing, wealthy, penitent, adoring, praising, diligent and virginal women* (66:5).⁴ Hearing this, they said, "we are sorry."⁵

7.6] It has also come to me, through an account whose veracity none doubt, that the above-mentioned Aiesse⁶ came to him and found him alone with a woman. And going away for a little bit, she returned, when the woman could no longer be found. Muḥammad said to her, "This woman," he remarked, "was Sanity who came to me to ask that I request sanity from God for her." Aiesse did not respond to him on account of fear. Note well an adulter's tale which lacks <even> any artifice.⁷

¹ I. e., Muḥammad.

² *Sūrat al-Taḥrīm*, the Sūrah (66) of Prohibition.

³ I. e., Muḥammad.

⁴ This verse has suffered multiple mistranslation. "Muslim" (Latin *Saracenas*) here renders the Arabic *muslimāt* which in the context means "women submitted to God" rather than "Muslims" *per se*; "wealthy" (Latin *locupletes*) is a misreading of the Arabic *qānitāt* (pious women) as *ghaniyāt* (wealthy women); "diligent" (Latin *agiles*) is a complete misreading of *ṭhayyibāt* meaning "widows" or "divorcées."

⁵ With this paragraph the author has returned to the matter of Māriyah the Copt and Muḥammad's wives with which he began the chapter. The author quotes parts of 66:4-5, with Muḥammad actually reading them to two of his wives; and indeed the commentaries typically observe that these verses "were revealed to the Prophet as a warning (*taḥdhīran*) to his women" (those women often being identified specifically as 'Ā'ishah and Ḥaḥṣah) on account of their jealousy and their improper desire to keep Muḥammad from Māriyah; see al-Ṭabarī on 66:4-5; 28, pp. 160-65, esp. p. 163; and Ibn Kathīr on 66:1-5; 4, pp. 606-10.

⁶ See 7.2 above.

⁷ Although the author insists that he has learned this tale from a reliable

7.7] Cum autem super hiis cresceret murmur, congregans populum dixit quod est in Capitulo *Elahzab*:¹ “Descendere fecit Dominus super me Alchoranum:” *Nos concessimus tibi vxores tuas quibus dediisti mercedes, et quod pos/sederit {246v} dextera tua*—hoc est quantum habueris posse—*de hoc. Quidem Deus dedit tibi filias auunculi tui et materterarum tuarum, et mulierem credentem, si ultro se prophetae dono obtulerit.* Et cito post: *Adoptabis ex eis quam uolueris et tibi aplicabis quam uolueris*—hoc est denique quae senuerit ex eis, si uolueris retinebis. Amouitque² tunc quandam quae dicebatur Nigra et alias seniores; cumque super hiis uerba multiplicarentur, timens ne lex sua corrumperetur, dixit quod est in Capitulo *Elahzab*:³ *Non licet, inquit Deus,*⁴ *faeminam accipere de caetero neque pro eis alias cambire*⁵ *uxores, etiamsi*⁶ *spetiositas earum te allexerit: compescere*⁷ *ab incestu.*

¹ Elhazab P

² -que] quia P: autem P²

³ Elhazab P

⁴ Deo P

⁵ commutare P²

⁶ etsi P²

⁷ compescere] abstinebis P²

7.7] When, however, grumbling about these things grew, he, gathering together the people, said that which is in the Chapter of *Elahzab*:¹ “The Lord made <these verses of> the Qur’ān descend upon me:” *We allowed you your wives to whom you have given gifts, and whatever your right hand possessed*—that is as much as you have in <your> power—*of this. Indeed God gave you the daughters of your uncle and your aunts, and a believing woman if she voluntarily offered herself to the prophet as a gift.* And soon after: *You will select² from among those whomever you wish and will attach to yourself whomever you wish* (cf. 33:50-51)—that is, in short, she among them who will have grown old, if you want, keep <her>. And he put away then a certain one called Nigra³ and other older ones. And when words multiplied about these things, fearing lest his religion be ruined, he said that which is in the Chapter of *Elahzab*:⁴ *It is not permitted, God says, to take any women henceforth,⁵ nor to exchange other wives for them, even if their beauty attracts you: be restrained from unchastity* (33:52).

account (*historia*), I have found no ḥadīth containing anything like these peculiar events.

¹ *Sūrat al-Aḥzāb*, the Sūrah (33) of The Confederates.

² Another translation error; the Latin *adoptabis* (“you will choose, select”) is just the opposite in meaning from the Arabic *turjī* of the Qur’ān meaning “repudiate.” The mood of this and the following verb (permissive in Arabic) was also mistranslated by the Latin future indicative.

³ I. e., Sawdah bint Zam‘ah, Muḥammad’s second wife whom he divorced in 8 A. H. after she became old and fat. The translators, seeing the name *Sawdah*, assumed that it was a feminine adjectival form of the root *SWD* which means “black,” and so translated it with the corresponding Latin form *Nigra*. Actually, though *Sawdah* is probably from the same root, it means something like “a piece of black earth,” or “a land in which are palm trees.” See “Sawdah bint Zam‘ah,” EI¹ 7:186 [art. V. Vacca] and E. Lane, *An Arabic-English Lexicon*, 4, p. 1461c. Ḥadīths describing Muḥammad’s repudiation of Sawdah bint Zam‘ah and other wives are usually quoted in the commentaries in the course of explicating the three verses quoted in this paragraph; see al-Ṭabarī on 33:51; 22, p. 25.

⁴ See previous note but one.

⁵ The Latin *de caetero*, which would more naturally appear to mean “from another,” is here a rather peculiar translation of the Arabic’s *min* (“from”) *ba‘du* (“then”) meaning “henceforth.”

7.8] Postea Mecouques Rex presentauit¹ ei supradictam Mariam quam accepit, et improperauerunt ei homines supradictam sententiam, quod non liceret ei accipere alias mulieres. Et respondit eis Machometus, “quando² uenit mihi illa Maria, dixit mihi Deus, ‘Resume uerbum tuum’”—id est “revoca.”

7.9] Fertur etiam in historiis eorum verissimis quod ad uisionem vxoris Zeid, nutricis suae pulchrae ualde, obstupuit Machometus. Quod audiens Zeid ab uxore Zeineb, dixit Machometo quod vellet eam repudiare: “Vereor,” ait, “ne concupieris eam.” Qui respondit, “Tene tibi vxorem tuam et fidens esto in Deo.” Immo ait Zeid, “Volo eam repudiare.” Audiens haec Machometus gauisus est nimis et cecidit in {247r} faciem et recuruaetae sunt manus et pedes et operuerunt eum. Et surgens ait, “Visionem misit ad me³ Deus, increpans pro uxore Zeid.” Et dixerunt, “Quod⁴ est illud, nuncie⁵ Dei?”

7.10] Et⁶ dixit sententiam quae est in Capitulo *Elahzab* cum dixerit ei⁷ super quam gratiam posuit: *Accipe tibi uxorem tuam*

¹ praesentauit] obtulit *P*²

² quomodo *P*²

³ ad me] mihi *P*²

⁴ Quod] Quidnam *P*²

⁵ nuncie] revelationis *P*²

⁶ Et] Tunc *P*²

⁷ dixerit ei] alloquutus eum *P*²

7.8] Afterwards Mecouques the King¹ presented to him the above-mentioned Maria whom he accepted, and men reproached him with the above verse, that it was not permitted to him to take other women. And Muḥammad responded to them: "When this Maria came to me, God said to me, 'Take back your word'"—that is, "revoke <your word>."

7.9] It is reported in their most true histories that upon seeing Zeid's² wife, his very beautiful nurse,³ Muḥammad was amazed. Zeid, hearing this from his wife Zeinab,⁴ said to Muḥammad that he wanted to repudiate her: "I fear," he said, "that you will continue to desire her." He responded, "Keep your wife for yourself and have faith in God." But Zeid said, "I want to repudiate her." Hearing this Muḥammad was joyful beyond measure, and he fell on his face, and his hands and feet were bent backward, and they covered him. And rising he said, "God, thundering on behalf of the wife of Zeid, has sent a vision to me." And they said, "What is this, prophet of God?"

7.10] And he said the verse which is in the Chapter of *Elah-zab*⁵ when <God> spoke to him <the verse> for which

¹ I. e., al-Muḥawqis (Latin, *Macouques Rex Iacabitorum*) mentioned above in 7.2. The author adds the following details (whose origin I do not know) involving Māriyah the Copt as an example of how Muḥammad did not adhere to the proscription set out in v. 33:52 cited just above.

² I. e., Zayd ibn Hārithah, Companion and adopted son of the Prophet. The Latin here would be more naturally translated as "upon a vision of the wife of Zayd," but, as the sources of this passage (see below) make clear, the meaning of the passage is probably as I have rendered it.

³ "nurse" (*nutrix*) seems rather odd here since Zaynab was not Muḥammad's nurse. But note that one of the Arabic words for "nurse" is *rabībah*, a word which usually means "step-daughter" or "female ward", but which can also mean "step-mother," and "guardian" (just like its semantic opposite *rābbah* which is the normal word for "step-mother," "guardian," etc. [cf. the *Glossarium*, p. 341, where *nutrix* is defined as *rābbah*]; cf. E. Lane, *An Arabic-English Lexicon* 3, p. 1005c). The Christian author, therefore, may have written *rabībah* meaning "ward" or "a female cared for by Muḥammad" because Zaynab and the Prophet were cousins (both being grandchildren of 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib), and Muḥammad apparently was at one time her guardian since he gave her in marriage to Zayd; see "Zaynab bint Djaḥsh," EI¹ 8:1199. The translators then misunderstood the term, translating *rabībah* as *nutrix*.

⁴ I. e., Zaynab bint Jaḥsh, wife of Zayd and, after he divorced her, wife of the Prophet.

⁵ See 7.7 above.

fidens de Deo. Tu celas in anima tua quod Deus propalat et formidas homines, sed iustum est ut Deum formides. Cum enim respuit eam Zeid maritauimus eam tibi, O Machomete. Et dixit Zeid, “nunquid duxisti eam adhuc, nuncie Dei?” Respondit, “Ve tibi! Deus ipse maritauit eam mihi de caelo, et super hoc sunt testes Michael et Gabriel.” Et festinauit intrare ad eam. Quae¹ postea inter alias uxores se iactabat quod Deus maritauerat eam de caelo. Illas autem propinqua² de talibus flagitiis quae sunt ad perniciosum exemplum facere, Alchoranum de quo oratur et psallitur et Deum Euangeliorum fingere patronum, extremae dementiae est.³

7.11] Item in penultimo capitulo huius operis ponitur haec lex immundissima, nec minus irrationabilis, quae habetur in Capitulo Vaccae, quod *si uir repudiaret uxorem suam* tres repudationes, *non reciperet illam nisi cognosceret prius alium uirum ab illo;*

¹ Quae] Haec P²

² propinqui P

³ Illas autem. . . dementiae est.] Illum autem propinqui de talibus flagitiis arguebant quod (?) sunt ad perniciosum exemplum; quodque ex iis magis faceret Alcoranum cum quo oratur et psallitur et Deum Euangeliorum fingeret patronum extremae dementiae esse. P²

<Muḥammad> gave thanks: *Keep your wife to yourself having faith in God. You hide in your soul what God makes public and you fear men, but it is just that you fear God. For when Zeid repudiated her, we married her to you* (33:37), O Muḥammad. And Zeid said, "Have you married her now, messenger of God?" He responded, "Woe to you! God himself married her to me from heaven, and Michael and Gabriel are witnesses to this."¹ And he hurried to go to her. Afterward she² boasted about herself among the other wives that God had married her <to Muḥammad> from heaven. To make those women who are in close proximity to such shameful acts into a pernicious example, and to depict the Qur'ān from which one prays and chants and the God of the Gospels as the patron <of these acts> is extreme dementia.³

7.11] Likewise in the second to last chapter of this work⁴ is laid out this most filthy and no less irrational law which is contained in the Chapter of the Cow,⁵ that *if a man should repudiate his wife with three repudiations,⁶ he may not take her back unless*

¹ Riccoldo's *Itinerarium* 35.21, p. 140 quotes Muḥammad making exactly this same warning to Zayd in almost exactly the same language.

² I. e., Zaynab.

³ The circumstances described in paragraphs 7.9-10, while embellished considerably—e. g. Muḥammad's lustful joy at Zayd's repudiation of Zaynab and his contortions—are based on the Traditional Islamic explanation of the occasion for the revelation of vv. 33:37ff. Zaynab's beauty did please Muḥammad; hearing of this Zayd did offer to repudiate her; Muḥammad told him to cleave to her; Zayd repudiated her anyway; the verse was therefore revealed to make clear to the Prophet that he should not worry about what people think since God himself had joined him and Zaynab in marriage; Zaynab did boast to the other wives that her marriage to Muḥammad was unique: God had married them "from heaven." The verses, the commentaries, and other Traditional literature (e. g. al-Ṭabārī on 33:37; 22, p. 12-14; cf. al-Bukhārī 97. 22. 3; and Ibn Sa'd, *al-Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā* 8, pp. 101ff.) make all this quite clear, which is why this event became the classic instance in Medieval Christian polemic of "self-induced revelation" on the part of Muḥammad; cf. N. Daniel, *Islam and the West*, p. 31

⁴ It is not at all clear what work is being referred to here, since the second to the last chapter of *Liber denudationis* does not include anything like what follows. The most likely possibility is that it is some source which the author has at hand while composing his treatise.

⁵ See 6.3 above.

⁶ I. e., "by pronouncing the *ṭalāq* three times," as Islamic law requires (see "Ṭalāk," EI¹ 4:636-40 [art. J. Schacht]). This portion has been inserted into the verse to explain (correctly) its context, for this additional information about

quod si repudiaret eam et compleret numerum eius, rediret ad uirum priorem si ipsa hoc eligeret; quod si calcaret eam uir secundus menstruosam, non liceret primo eam recipere donec cognosceret eam si/ne {247v} menstruis; quod si eam cognosceret < * * * > ueretro rigidato. O lex non tam uiris debita, quam iumentis!

7.12] Et quia quidam glutto¹ hora prandii pulsabat in domo² Machometi ut comederet, fecit inde legem, ponens³ in Capitulo *Elahzab*, quod nullus comesturus ueniret nisi inuitatus. Vilia sunt haec.

7.13] Cum istis etiam intexuit narrationes prophetarum tam notorum quam ignotorum, ut Saleh et Houd, Saib quoque et Loth

¹ glutto] parasitus *P*²

² in domo] ad domum *P*²

³ ponens] quam inseruit *P*²

she has sex with another man besides him¹ first (2:230); that if he should repudiate her and should complete the number of it,² then she may return to the prior man if she herself should choose this;³ that if a second man should tread upon her⁴ while she is menstruating, it is not permissible for the first to take her back until <the second man> has sex with her when she is not menstruating; that if he should have sex with her <* * *> with an erect private part.⁵ O law indebted not so much to men as to beasts!

7.12] And because a certain glutton was knocking on the house of Muḥammad at the hour of a meal so that he might eat, he made thereupon a law, placing it in the Chapter of *Elahzab*,⁶ that none might come to eat unless invited (cf. 33:53). These are vile things.

7.13] With such things he also interwove accounts of the prophets both known and unknown, such as Saleh and Houd and Saib also,⁷ and Lot and Job and Jonah,⁸ and he gathered together

divorce is supplied earlier in the same Qur'ānic passage as well as in the commentaries on this same verse; see, e. g., Ibn Kathīr on 2:230; 1, p. 415.

¹ The Latin *ab eo* is the translators' rather inexact rendering of the Arabic *ghayrahu* meaning "other than him;" I have translated the Latin accordingly: "besides him."

² I. e., if he repudiates her completely by pronouncing the *ṭalāq* the required three times (see previous note but one).

³ On the use of this verse polemically see chapter three of this study; cf. the similar discussions in *Quadruplex reprobatio*, fol. 154va.

⁴ I. e., "had sex with her." Among the many euphemisms used in Arabic to refer to sexual intercourse is the verb *waṭi'a* which means to "tread on" or "to trample" or "to mount". The translators rendered this literally with *calco* ("to tread on") which lacks any such sexual connotation.

⁵ Much of this paragraph was included by Riccoldo in his *Contra legem Saracenorum* in paraphrased form; one particular sentence provides a clear idea of what the sense of the missing portion here was: "That if he knew her with a not-fully erect private part, then it is further proper that he know her with a fully erect member." ("Quod si etiam cognouit eam ueretro non bene erecto oportet ulterius quod cognoscat eam bene regato membro") (Riccoldo, *Contra legem Saracenorum* 8, p. 95, ll. 136-37).

⁶ See 7.7 above.

⁷ Ṣālih, Hūd, and Shu'ayb: non-Biblical prophets mentioned in the Qur'ān. See e.g. Qur'ān 7:65-93.

⁸ Lūṭ (Lot), Ayyūb (Job), and Yūnūs (Jonah): Old Testament figures mentioned in the Qur'ān as prophets. See e.g. Qur'ān 7:80-84, 6:84-86.

et Iob et Iona, et alia congregauit de Veteri Testamento et Euangelio et Psalmis Daud, iterando et reiterando adeo quod si ea quae sunt a Moise subtraxeris, Alchorani quarta pars remanebit. Et aliena sic inserit quasi ipse inuenerit, fur arrogans et improbus computator.¹

¹ computator] plagiarius *p*²

other things from the Old Testament and the Gospel and the Psalms of David, by repeating and re-repeating to such point that if you subtract those things which are from Moses,¹ <only> a quarter part of the Qur'ān will remain.² And thus he intermingles foreign things, just as if he invented them, the arrogant thief and dishonest plagiarist.³

¹ I. e., from the Pentateuch.

² The Annotator also observed that Muḥammad “interwove” (*intexit*) Biblical and non-Biblical material, fol. 33ra rm c. ll. 13-19.

³ On the translation of the Latin *computator* as “plagiarist” see above, p. 222.

OCTAUUM CAPITULUM.¹ DE HOC QUOD DICIT
TALEM ALCHORANUM HOMINES ET ANGELOS
NON POTUISSE FECISSE,² ET QUOD PROPHETA
GENERALIS EST AD OMNES GENTES.

8.1] Tanta etiam arrogantiae semper fuit quod in Capitulo Filiorum Isrrael inducit Dominum dicentem sibi, *Dic: si conuenerunt³ homines et spiritus ut afferant talem Alchoranum, non uenient⁴ cum tali, etiamsi se mutuo⁵ adiuuarent*. O falsissima et auditu horrenda iactan/tia! {248r} Sed etsi qua furatur aliena bona, infinities⁶ replicat ea. Si uero posuerit sua, aut de suis adulteriis patronum inuocat Deum, aut et⁷ de suis mendatiis archangelos contestatur in fictionibus uisionum. Et in dictis⁸ immemor conscientiae⁹ sibi ipsi saepissime contradicit. Etsi illuc referre uoluerimus,¹⁰ omnes boni angeli et homines non possent quia¹¹ suum < * * * > non¹² est tanta mendationum portenta cum¹³ tanta impudentia congregare.¹⁴

8.2] Si dicatis quod in lingua Arabica, quae fuit proprie sua, cum magna facundia docuerit Arabes, respondebimus quod in multis locis faeda¹⁵ utitur oratione, vt est illud: *Dic: O uos infideles! Non adoro quod adoratis, nec uos adorantes estis quod*

¹ Octauum capitulum *post* ad omnes gentes *infra transp.* P²

² facere P²

³ conuenerint P²

⁴ uenirent P²

⁵ mutuo P² *et sic Alchoranus* (wa-law kāna ba^cduhum li-ba^cdin zahīran):

multo P

⁶ infinities] perpetuo et vicibus infinitis P²

⁷ aut et] ubi P²

⁸ in dictis] dictorum P²

⁹ conscientia P²; *et post* conscientia *add.* vrgente P²

¹⁰ *post* uoluerimus *add.* siue sic sua dicta in ipsum contorquere P²

¹¹ *post* quia *add.* in eo P²

¹² nihil P²

¹³ cum] insunt P²

¹⁴ congregare] omnia vndique raptim congregata P²

¹⁵ faeda] inepta P²

THE EIGHTH CHAPTER. ON THE FACT THAT
HE SAYS THAT MEN AND ANGELS COULD
NOT HAVE MADE SUCH A QUR'ĀN,
AND THAT THE PROPHET IS UNIVERSAL FOR
ALL NATIONS.

8.1] Now he¹ was always of such arrogance that in the Chapter of the Children of Israel² he introduced the Lord³ saying to him,⁴ *Say: if men and spirits gather together in order to produce such a Qur'ān, they will not come forth with such, even if they help each other* (17:88).⁵ O most false and horrible-to-hear boasting! Even if he steals some things belonging to others which are good, he repeats them endlessly. But if he puts forth his own <ideas>, he either invokes God as the defender of his adulteries, or, in the fictions of <his> visions, he calls archangels as witnesses for his lies. And in <his> sayings, forgetful of knowledge of right and wrong, he very frequently contradicts himself. Even if we wanted to give an example, all good angels and men would not be able <to do this> because their <* * *> is not to assemble such great monstrosities of lies with so much impudence.

8.2] If you say that he taught the Arabs with great eloquence in the Arabic language, which was his own, we will answer that in many places he used a foul manner of speaking, such as is this: *Say: O you unbelievers! I do not worship what you worship, nor are you worshipping what I worship, nor do I worship what you worship, nor are you worshipping what I worship* (109:1-5); and this: *We have set up your sleep as sleep* (78:9) or “sleeping.”

¹ I. e., Muḥammad.

² *Sūrat Banī Isrā'īl*, the Sūrah (17) of the Children of Israel.

³ See 3.4 above (“impersonating God”).

⁴ I. e., Muḥammad.

⁵ This verse is used by Muslim apologists as evidence of the Qur'ān's miraculous nature; see Abū al-Walīd al-Bājī's “*Risālat al-rāhib min Ifransah [wa-] jawāb Abī al-Walīd al-Bājī 'alā hādhihī al-risālah*,” p. 107. Cf. Riccoldo's similar polemical use of the verse in *Itinerarium* 35.11, p. 140.

ego adoro, nec ego adoro quod adoratis, nec uos estis adorantes quod ego adoro; et illud: *Statuimus somnum¹ uestrum somnum* uel dormitationem. Item in Capitulo de Iona de existentibus in igne: *Occultabunt paenitentiam² suam*; uoluit dicere “patefacient.”³

8.3] Sed ponamus quod ueniat unus Arabs cum simili eloquentia—nunquam fuit—:⁴ nunquid ut prophetam⁵ recipietis eum cum⁶ nec signum neque certitudinem habeat suae prophetiae quibus caruit Machometus? Quod et⁷ idem Propheta uester timuit dicens, “Ego sum ultimus prophetarum, et non est prophetia post me. Quicumque autem se dixerit prophetam post me mendax est. Interficite eum.” Quanta temeritas praeiudicare⁸ Deo quod post Machometum non possit Deus donare alicui sancto spiritum prophe/tiae! {248v}

8.4] Et iterum in Capitulo Prophetarum, fingit Deum dicentem sibi, *Non destinauimus te nisi misericordiam sapientibus*. Et iterum in Capitulo *Seba*: *Non misimus te nisi ad uniuersitatem gentium*. Respice et attendite praesumptionis tuae mendatium quod te fingis nuntium Dei. Uadis⁹ ad uniuersitatem gentium in¹⁰ septuaginta linguis.¹¹ Nescis tuum nuntium recitare nisi in¹² Arabica lingua: nonne eris eis barbarus et ipsi tibi?¹³

¹ somnum *P*² et sic etiam *Alcoranus* (nawm): somnium *P*

² paenitentiam] pecuniam *P*²

³ patefacient *P*²: patefaciens *P*

⁴ post fuit add. at poscimus *P*²

⁵ prophetam *P*²: non liquet *P*

⁶ Cum] etiamsi *P*²

⁷ Quod et] Hoc *P*²

⁸ praeiudicare] tollere *P*²

⁹ post Uadis add. et pergis *P*²

¹⁰ in] cum *P*²

¹¹ post linguis add. et *P*²

¹² in exp. *P*²

¹³ et ipsi tibi] tu tibi ipsi *P*²

Likewise in the Chapter of Jonah¹ regarding those living in hell: *They will hide their penitence* (10:54); he meant to say “they will make manifest.”²

8.3] But let us suppose that one Arab should come with similar eloquence—he³ never was <such a one>—: will you accept him as a prophet when he has neither sign nor sure indication of his prophecy, which Muḥammad <also> lacked? This same prophet of yours feared this, saying: “I am the last of the prophets, and there is no prophecy after me.”⁴ Indeed anyone who calls himself a prophet after me is a liar. Kill him.” Such boldness, to decide beforehand for God that after Muḥammad God cannot give to any holy man the spirit of prophecy!

8.4] And again in the Chapter of the Prophets⁵ he pretends that God says⁶ to him, *I did not send you except as a mercy to the learned* (21:107).⁷ And again in the Chapter of *Seba*:⁸ *I did not send you except to all the nations* (34:28). Notice and pay heed to the lie of your presumption, that you pretend that you are a messenger of God. You go out to the totality of the nations in seventy languages. <Yet> you do not know how to recite your message other than in the Arabic language: will you not be a foreigner to them and they to you?

¹ I. e., *Sūrat Yūnus*, the Sūrah (10) of Jonah

² In this paragraph the author gives what he believes are three examples of the foul (*faeda*) language of the Qur’ān: 109:1-5 because of its repetitiveness; 78:9 because it is apparently tautologous (in Arabic, *ja’alnā nawmakum subātan*, “We have made your sleep a rest”); 10:54 because he seems to believe (wrongly) that the context requires the opposite of “they will hide” (*occultabunt*).

³ I. e., Muḥammad.

⁴ Statements very like this can be found attributed to the Prophet in ḥadīths recorded by al-Bukhārī (60. 50. 3) and Ibn Ḥanbal (1, p. 185; 2, p. 172). I have not found any sources for the two sentences that follow, however.

⁵ *Sūrat al-Anbiyā’*, the Sūrah (21) of the Prophets.

⁶ See 3.4 above (“impersonating God”).

⁷ This verse is literally and correctly translated except for the last word. The Qur’ān has *al-‘ālamūn*, “the worlds”; the translators, however, read this as *al-‘ālimūn*, a plural for “scholar” or “learned one” or “wiseman” (hence *sapientes*), and this because the two words look exactly the same in unvocalized script.

⁸ *Sūrat Sabā’*, the Sūrah (34) of Sheba.

8.5] Prius dicebas te missum Prophetam Arabibus quia Dei nuntium non habuerant. Immo habuerant quos omnium linguarum peritia repleuerat Spiritus Sanctus, discipulos Christi. Modo dicis te missum ad uniuersitatem gentium de quibus certum est nec te ipsos < nec ipsos > te posse¹ intelligere. Solis Hebraeis Hebraeus Moises missus est. Apostoli quibus dedit omnem linguarum peritiam Spiritus mitti ad vniuersitatem gentium debuerunt; praeceperat enim Christus eis: *Ite, docete omnes gentes*. Vnde et continuo misit eis Spiritum Sanctum quod omnes linguas eos doceret, et docuit in momento.

8.6] Unde in Capitulo de Iona dicitur cum ad Machometum ueniret gens quaedam que vocatur Choreis, dixit ei, "Tune opinaris quod Deus locutus fuerit istum Alchoranum?" Respondit, "etiam." Dixerunt, "Conueniebat itaque quod descendissent super te vniuersae linguae ut posses alloqui uniuersos. Rogamus itaque ut Deum roges² descendere super te Alchoranum in alio idiomate quam in Arabico ut sequa/mur {249r} te." Respondit quod est in Capitulo de Iona: *Dicent qui non sperant inuentionem nostram, "muta Alchoranum." Dic: "et unde hoc mihi ut immutem eum per me ipsum?"* Cumque adhuc instarent non quod immutaret sed in alia lingua ederet per Dei reuelationem, nihil nisi ex transuerso potuit respondere, dicens, "Deus dedit uobis quod constituerit³

¹ te posse] nec ipsos te potuisse P²

² roges] ores P²

³ constituit P²

8.5] Previously you were saying that you were a prophet sent to the Arabs, since they had not had a messenger of God. But indeed they had had those whom the Holy Spirit had filled with knowledge of all languages, the disciples of Christ. You now say that you are sent to the totality of nations in regard to whom it is certain that neither are you able to understand them nor they you. The Hebrew Moses was sent to the Hebrews alone. The Apostles to whom the Spirit gave all knowledge of languages necessarily were sent to the totality of nations; for Christ had ordered them: *Go, teach all nations* (Mt. 28:19).¹ For this reason He immediately sent them the Holy Spirit in order that he teach them all languages, and he taught <them> in an instant.

8.6] For this reason it is said in the Chapter of Jonah² <that> when a certain nation who are called Choreis³ came to him they⁴ said to him, "Do you think that God uttered this Qur'ān?" He answered, "Yes." They said, "It was fitting, in that case, that all languages should have descended⁵ upon you so that you be able to speak to everyone. We ask, therefore, that you ask God to make the Qur'ān descend⁶ upon you in a language other than Arabic so that we may follow you." He responded with what is in the Chapter of Jonah:⁷ *Those who do not wish to meet us will say, "change the Qur'ān." Say: "and whence is it to me that I should change it by myself"* (10:15)? And when they still insisted, not that he change <the Qur'ān>, but that he produce it in another language through God's revelation, he was able to respond only obliquely, saying, "God gave to you that which he established for you.

¹ The Latin text's version of this verse is slightly different from the Vulgate version: "Euntes ergo docete omnes gentes."

² See 8.2 above.

³ I. e., Quraysh, the powerful tribe of which Muḥammad was a member.

⁴ The Latin text has the singular verb *dixit* here, its subject being *gens* meaning "nation." But since the Latin translators begin using plural verbs to refer to this "nation who are called Choreis" just below, I have also done so here for clarity's sake.

⁵ The Latin verb *descendo* ("to descend") here doubtless translates the Arabic verb *NZL* I which means both "to descend" and "to be revealed."

⁶ Here the Latin infinitive *descendere* appears to translate the verbal noun *inzāl* meaning both "to send down" and "to reveal."

⁷ See 8.2 above.

uobis. Nuntium illum recipite et a quo prohibet¹ uos prohibeamini.” Nihil igitur restabat respondere nisi quia “tenere sumus parati quod linguis omnium gentium mandauit Spiritus Sanctus. Sed tu es nuntius mortis.” Ipsi tamen tacuerunt.

8.7] Cum autem Machometo adqueuissent quidam praepositis illecti—quidam inuiti, pauci spontanei—et firmatum esset ei imperium iuxta desiderium suum, institisset quod eius discessus ab eis < * * * > in Capitulo *Elahqua*:² *Nescio quid fiet de me siue de uobis*. Similiter in Capitulo *Seba*,³ id est “praedationis:” *Testor Deum: et uos et ego utinam simus in directione uel in errore patente*.⁴ Sermo iste non est occultus ab eis,⁵ sed legunt eum⁶ in Alchorano etiam orationibus suis. Quando surgunt de⁷ nocte, legunt et orant hoc *elfoquera*, id est sui perfecti, quia Machometus nesciuit neque de statu suo et omnium Sarracenorum, neque quid fieret de eo post mortem.

¹ prohibet *P*²: prohibent *P*

² *Elahguag P et post verbum hoc add. ait P*²

³ *Sabe P*²

⁴ *patenti P*²

⁵ *occultus ab eis] eis occultus P*²

⁶ *illum P*²

⁷ *de] in P*²

Accept that messenger and prohibit yourselves from what he prohibits.” Nothing therefore remained to respond except that “we are prepared to hold to what the Holy Spirit enjoined in the languages of all the nations. But you are a messenger of death.” They then fell silent.¹

8.7] But when certain ones enticed by the offices of overseer—certain ones unwilling, a few willing—had assented to Muḥammad, and ruling authority was made strong in him according to his will, he had insisted that his leaving from them < * * * > in the Chapter of *Elahquaq*:² *I do not know what will happen regarding me or regarding you* (46:9). Similarly in the Chapter of *Seba*, that is “of the Plundering”:³ *I call upon God as a witness: would that you and I were in direction or in plain error* (34:24).⁴ This sentence is not hidden from them, but they read it in the Qur’ān even for their prayers. When they rise at night, the *elfoqera*,⁵ that is their perfect men, read and pray this; for Muḥammad knew nothing of his state and <the state> of all Muslims or of what would happen to him after death.

¹ The commentaries are agreed that some polytheists (perhaps from among Quraysh) asked the Prophet to change the Qur’ān in certain ways—changing what is prohibited (*al-ḥarām*) into what is allowed (*al-ḥalāl*), for example—but they say nothing about Quraysh asking Muḥammad to produce the Holy Book in another language; cf. al-Ṭabarī on 10:15; 11, pp. 94-95; Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Qurṭubī on 10:15; 8, pp. 318-19; Ibn Kathīr on 10:15; 2, p. 635.

² *Sūrat al-Aḥqāf*, the Sūrah (46) of the Sand Dunes.

³ As noted above (see 8.4 and commentary), the Latin *Capitulum Seba* translates *Sūrat Sabā*, the Sūrah (34) of Sheba; the translators say it means *praedatio* (“plundering”) perhaps because they misread *Sabā* as *sibā* which means “capturing” or “leading off into captivity.”

⁴ The Qur’ān’s Arabic—*‘alā hudan aw fī ḍalāl mubīn*—means “on the right way (i.e., having embraced the true religion of Islam) or in clear error.” The modal adverb *utinam* (= “would”) has been gratuitously added here by the translators.

⁵ *elfoqera* is doubtless the translators’ transliteration of *al-fuqarā*, the plural of *al-faqīr* which means “the poor one,” and which is thus the term often used to refer to Ṣūfī mendicants.

NONUM CAPITULUM.¹ DE MULTIS IN QUIBUS
CONTRADICIT SIBI IPSI.

9.1] Dicentem,² “nos creauimus caelum et terram,”³ {249v} inducit autem Deum pluries. Et in Capitulo *Elnazea*⁴ dicit Deum prius creasse caelos, postea terram: *Sic et uos*, inquit, *estisne fortioris*—id est⁵ *principalioris—creationis quam caelum?* Et⁶ *aedificauit illud, extulitque altitudinem illius, parauitque illud et fundauit noctem eius, protulitque antelucanum eius. Namque post haec plantauit terram.* Hic dicit quod prius fecit caelum quam terram.

9.2] In Capitulo uero *Hamim*,⁷ ubi inclinant audientes,⁸ contradicens ait quod prius terram fecit quam caelum sic:⁹ *Quid uobis est ut blasphemetis eum qui creauit terram in*¹⁰ *duobus diebus, et statuitis ei participem? Ipse enim pater est*

¹ Nouum capitulum *post* quibus condtradicit ipsi *infra transp.* P²

² Dicente P

³ Dicentem... *terram*] *post* de eo *post* mortem *supra transp.* P, *sed verba haec exp.* P²

⁴ Dicentem nos. . . Elnazea] Quoties autem Mahometus dicit, *Nos creauimus coelum et terram*, pluries inducit Dominum. Et in Capitulo Elnasa P²

⁵ id est] idem P: aut P²

⁶ et *exp.* P²

⁷ Hanami P²

⁸ *post* audientes *add.* sibi P²

⁹ *post* sic *add.* ait P²

¹⁰ in *exp.* P²

THE NINTH CHAPTER. ON MANY
THINGS IN WHICH HE CONTRADICTS HIMSELF.

9.1] Now many times he introduces God <into the Qur'ān>¹ saying "we created heaven and earth." Indeed in the Chapter of *Elnazeat*² he says that first God created the heavens, afterward the earth: *Thus also you*,³ he says, *are you not harder*—that is, earlier⁴—*to create than heaven? And he built it*,⁵ *and raised up the height of it, and prepared it, and founded its night, and brought forth its dawn. And after these things he set in place the earth* (79:27-30). Here he says that <God> made heaven before the earth.

9.2] But in the Chapter of *Hamim*,⁶ where certain listeners turn away,⁷ contradicting <this> he says that He made earth before heaven, as follows: *What is it with you that you should blaspheme Him who created earth in two days, and set up a partner with Him?*⁸ *For He is the father of the worlds, and He established*

¹ See above 3.4 and commentary.

² *Sūrat al-Nāzi'āt*, the Sūrah (79) of Those Who Draw Out.

³ God here speaks to the earth.

⁴ The author is here suggesting, quite improbably, that when the Qur'ān asks whether the earth was "harder to create" (*ashadd khalqan* in Arabic, unhappily translated into Latin as *fortioris creationis* which means "of stronger creation") than heaven it is actually asking whether the earth was created *before* heaven. This bizarre interpretation makes the verse fit the argument he pursues here.

⁵ I. e., heaven.

⁶ *Sūrat Hā Mīm al-Sajdah*, the Sūrah (41) of Hā Mīm (i. e., the Arabic letters H and M) of Prostration in Prayer (some sūrahs, e.g. 20, 36, 38, are referred to only by means of certain letters of the Arabic alphabet whose meaning remains obscure; Sūrah 41 is known by a combination of such letters and a more typical title *al-Sajdah*).

⁷ The Latin *inclino* could mean "to turn toward," "to be inclined to," etc. or "to turn away," "to be disinclined," etc. depending on the circumstances. The context (see Qur'ān 41:1-7) suggests the latter, and that what they are turning away from is God's true religion.

⁸ Though the Latin syntax here could be construed to mean "set up a partner with it (i. e., the earth)," the sense of the Qur'ānic Arabic ("wa-taj'alūna la-hu andādan" = "and you establish rivals [or partners] for Him") suggests that it be construed as I have done so here.

mundanorum, statuitque prominentes ultra eam, benedixitque ei, et proportionauit in ea uictus eius in quatuor diebus¹ ut sit² aequalitas petentibus. Idemque ascendit in caelum cum adhuc fumus esset, et dixit ei, caelo scilicet et terrae, “venistis sponte uel inuiti?” Responderunt ambo, “venimus obediētes.” Textus iste adnihilat praecedentem. Dixit itidem in Capitulo Vaccae de Deo, Ipse est qui creauit uobis quicquid in terram est, deuenitque ad caelum, fecitque ei septem caelos. Et in Capitulo Caph dixit econverso, Ego creauī caelos et terram.

9.3] Item de extrema die iudicii dixit in Capitulo Elmorselat, *Illā est dies³ non loquitur, nec dabitur eis loquendi licentia.* In Capitulo uero Elzomer dicit, *In die iudicii vos apud Dominum vestrum litigabitis.* Iterum in Capitulo Quad Efflegelmon ait, *Non*

¹ uictus. . . diebus] diebus quatuor, alimenta quae P^{2a} sed verba haec exp. et textum primum rest. P^{2b}

² esset P²

³ post dies add. in qua P²

<mountains> towering over it,¹ and He blessed it, and He proportioned its sustenance in it in four days² in order that it be equal to all seekers. And He ascended into heaven when it was still smoke, and He said to them, that is, to heaven and earth, "Do you come willingly or unwilling?" Both responded, "Obedient we come" (41:9-11). This text annihilates the preceding <text>. In the same way he said about God in the Chapter of the Cow,³ He is the one who created for you whatever is on earth, and He came to heaven, and made for it seven heavens (2:29). And in the Chapter of *Caph*⁴ he said conversely, I created the heavens and the earth (50:38).

9.3] Likewise regarding the final day of judgement⁵ he said in the Chapter of *Elmorselat*,⁶ That is the day <in which> he does not speak, and they will not be given licence to speak (77:35-36).⁷ But in the Chapter of *Elzomer*⁸ he says, In the day of judgement you will argue before your Lord (39:31). Again in the Chapter of *Quad Efflegelmon*⁹ he says, They will not bewail, and they will not

¹ The Arabic here is *ja'ala fihā rawāsiyā min fawqihā*, "He placed on it (i. e., the earth) firm mountains towering above it." The Latin *prominentes* translates only part of the meaning of *rawāsiyā* which by itself means "firm, towering mountains", and *supra* would have been better than *ultra*.

² I. e., God provided food on the earth in equal measure to all in four time periods.

³ See commentary to 6.3 above.

⁴ *Sūrat Qaf*, the Sūrah (50) of Qāf, I. e., the letter *Q*.

⁵ In this paragraph the author sets out a series of short lines from the Qur'ān, some of which seem to indicate that men will be able to speak on Judgement Day, some not. All the texts do come from passages dealing with Judgement Day in some way.

⁶ *Sūrat al-Mursalāt*, the Sūrah (77) of Those That are Sent.

⁷ On my translation of this problematic Latin version of the Qur'ānic Arabic see above pp. 224-25.

⁸ *Sūrat al-Zumar*, the Sūrah (39) of the Troops.

⁹ *Quad Efflegelmon*: This is a garbled transliteration of *qad aflaha al-mu'minūn* ("The believers have prospered"), the first verse of Sūrah 23 by which the author refers to it. Normally this sūrah is known simply as *Sūrat al-mu'minūn*, the Sūrah of the Believers, but it was also known by the longer title (cf. R. Paret, *Der Koran: Kommentar und Konkordanz*, p. 551, and the beginning of al-Ṭabarī's commentary on this sūrah: "Tafsīr sūrat qad aflaha al-mu'minūn . . . [The interpretation of the sūrah qad aflaha al-mu'minūn . . .];" 18, p. 1).

conquerentur {250r} neque conquerent adinuicem. Contradicit autem in Capitulo Elsaphat dicens, Incipient conqueri de se mutuo. Iterum in Capitulo Elaraf:¹ Sciscitemur ab hiis ad quos missi sunt, et sciscitemur² eos qui missi sunt. Et iterum in Capitulo Elhaiar id est "petra:"³ Per Deum sciscitabimur iniuriosos. Sed contradicit in Capitulo Qua Deffleg dicens, Cum flauerit in illos Deus non poterunt abscondi, neque conquerentur. Similiter in Capitulo Elameran:⁴ Non loquetur eis Deus neque respitiet in die iudicii.

9.4] Item in Capitulo Elmaiede quae⁵ interpretatur "mensa:" *Constituit Deus Elkaebe domum elharam*—quod interpretatur

¹ Elaraf P²

² sciscitemur] percontemur P²

³ petere P (vid. com.)

⁴ Elamran P²

⁵ post quae add. dictio P²

conquer¹ each other (23:65).² But he contradicts <this> in the Chapter of *Elsaphar*³ saying, *They will begin to complain about each other* (37:27). Again in the Chapter of *Elaraf*:⁴ *We will inform ourselves from those to whom they have been sent, and we will question those who have been sent* (7:6). And again in the Chapter of *Elhaiar*, that is “the Stone”:⁵ *By God! We will question the injurious* (15:92-93).⁶ But he contradicts <this> in the Chapter of *Qua Deffleg*⁷ saying, *When God will have blown on them they will not be able to be hidden, and they will not bewail each other* (23:101).⁸ Similarly in the Chapter of *Elameran*:⁹ *God will not speak to them, and He will not look back <at them> on the day of judgement* (3:77).

9.4] Likewise in the Chapter of *Elmaide*, which means “the Table”:¹⁰ *God made Elkaeba an elharam*—which means “booty”¹¹

¹ The Latin *non conquerent* (“they will not conquer”) here is a misunderstanding of the Arabic *tuṣṣarūna* (“you will not be helped”) arising from the fact that the root *NṢR* means both “to conquer” and “to help.”

² The Latin translators have misunderstood this verse. The Arabic reads *lā tajʿarū al-yawm . . . lā tuṣṣarūna*: “Do not supplicate [God] on that day . . . you will not be helped.”

³ *Sūrat al-Ṣāffāt*, the Sūrah (37) of the Rangers.

⁴ *Sūrat al-Aʿrāf*, the Sūrah (7) of the Heights.

⁵ The citation to follow is definitely from Sūrah 15 known as *Al-Hijr*, which the translators mistook above for *al-hajar*, “the stone” (see 3.4). They do the same thing here apparently, this time transliterating the Arabic *j* with an *i* (probably *i-longa* in the original) rather than *g*—their usual choice—and this time explaining that *al-haiar* means *petra* rather than *lapis*; *petra* then became *petere* through scribal errors. I have emended the text accordingly.

⁶ The Latin text here distorts the Arabic of the Qurʾān in which God, speaking about the day of judgement, says, “By God (*wa-Allāh*) we will ask them about what they have done.”

⁷ The Latin text’s *Qua Deffleg* is an even more garbled transliteration of the first verse of Sūrah 23 which the author uses as its title; see *Quad Efflegelmon* just above in this paragraph and the commentary to it.

⁸ The Latin version of this verse is rather inexact. Literally the Arabic reads “When the horn is blown (i. e., on Judgement Day) there will be no kinship (*ansāb*) between them and they will not inquire about each other (*yataṣāʾalūna*).”

⁹ See 6.4 above.

¹⁰ See 3.3 above.

¹¹ This is the translators’, or perhaps a later copyist’s (notice that this insertion is lacking in *M*), unwarranted interpretation of what *elharam* (see next note but one) means.

“praeda,”¹ haec est domus Mesquae—*assurrectionem*² *gentibus et mensem congregationis et directionis et stabili<ta>tionis*—hoc est,³ mensem ieiunii Sarracenismi—*et hoc ut sciatis quod Deus nouit quae in caelis et quae sunt in terra. Et Deus est noscens omne quod est.* Sed quis umquam rationis particeps dubitauit quin Deus sciret omnia? Sed esto quod dubitetur qualis est haec consequentia quod domus Mesquae et ieiunium mensis Sarracenismi facit scire quod Deus scit omnia, an quia puniet opera quae praecepit fieri in illo ieiunio, videlicet, quod a principio noctis usque in mane⁴ comedant, et mulieres impregnent, cum⁵ libri sacri in talibus diebus suadeant⁶ ne ad mulieres accedant.⁷

¹ quod interpretatur “praeda” *om. M*

² *assurrectionem*] ad *assurrectionem P²*

³ *assurrectionem. . . hoc est om. M*

⁴ *usque in mane*] *usquequo mane fiat P²*

⁵ *cum*] at ex opposito *P²*

⁶ *suadent P²*

⁷ *accedatur P²*

¹—house—this² is the house of Mecca³—as a raising up for the people⁴ and a month of gathering and direction and stability⁵—that is, the month of the fast of Islam⁶—and this in order that you know that God knows those things which are in heaven and those things which are on earth. And God knows all that is (5:97). But who possessing reason ever doubted that God knows all things? But let that which is questioned be how it follows that the house of Mecca and the fast of the month of Islam make one know that God knows all things, or whether or not He will punish the works which he⁷ ordered to be done in that fast, namely that from the beginning of the night until morning they should eat and impregnate women, when the holy books⁸ exhort that they not approach women during those days.⁹

¹ This is the translators', or perhaps a later copyist's (notice that this insertion is lacking in *M*), completely unwarranted interpretation of what *elharam* (see next note) means.

² The antecedent here is *Elkaeba* (see next note), not *house* (*domus*) which explains why the Latin pronoun here (*haec*) is feminine: both the Arabic which *Elkaeba* transliterates (*al-Ka'bah*) and the Latin transliteration are feminine in gender.

³ *Elkaebe* is the translators' version of *al-Ka'bah*, the famous shrine in Mecca, which, as this verse explains, God made the *bayt al-ḥarām* or "sacred house." Evidently not sure what the second word meant the translators simply transliterated it as *elharam*.

⁴ "a raising up for the people" translates the very awkward *assurrectionem gentibus* which is the translators' unhappy rendering of the Qur'ān's *qiyāman lil-nās*, which means "a fixed support for the people".

⁵ The Latin translators put "direction" (*directio* rendering *hady*; on meaning see below) and "stabilizing" (*stabilitatio*, see below) in the genitive even though they are clearly in the accusative case in the Arabic and should be understood as further objects of the main verb "to make" (*ja'ala, constituo*). Furthermore, *directio* is an understandable mistranslation of *hady* which, though it normally means something like "right guidance", here means "offering(s)". *Stabilitatio* ("stabilizing") is a thorough misunderstanding of the Qur'ān's *qalā'id* which means "garlands" or "necklaces".

⁶ I. e., Ramaḍān.

⁷ I. e., Muḥammad.

⁸ It is not clear what "holy books" the author has in mind.

⁹ The Muslim method of fasting during Ramaḍān always occasioned outrage and disparagement on the part of Christian polemicists; the remarks here are typical but surprisingly brief. See N. Daniel, *Islam and the West*, pp. 220-22.

9.5] Item dixit in Capitulo *Locquemen*¹ quod *firmamentum currit in mari per gratiam Dei vt ostendat uobis de suis {250v} mirabilibus, quia in hoc sunt mirabilia omni patienti et gratias agenti*. Vide parabolaе consequentiam nullam—quomodo apropiavit patientem et gratias agentem cursui firmamenti in mari. Uidetur tamen homo stolidus propter hoc fecisse comparationem² patienti, quia casus quidam firmamenti uidebatur esse ut in mare mergeretur, a quo mari distat in nocte quantum a terra in meridie.

9.6] Item in Capitulo Mariae dixit de paradisiocolis quod *habent in eo sufficientiam uictus mane et vespere*. Iste sermo importat quod sunt in paradiso horae diuersae, cum uos Sarraceni dicatis quod non erit ibi neque sol neque luna neque nox. Iterum in Capitulo *Houd* dicit quod *In paradiso erunt perpetuantes dum caeli et terra durauerint*. Iuxta uos qui caelum et terram transire creditis in resurrectione, usque ad resurrectionem solummodo in paradiso erunt.

9.7] Item in Capitulo *Elaaraf* inducit Deum dicentem, *Nos creauimus uos; postea formauimus uos, diximusque angelis: Adorate Adam*. Dicite quomodo prius creauerit et postea

¹ Locmanae P²

² post comparationem add. cum P²

9.5] Likewise he said in the Chapter of *Locquemen*¹ that *the firmament*² moves quickly into the sea through the grace of God in order that He show you some of His miracles,³ because in this are miracles for everyone who is steadfast and gives thanks (31:31). Notice the lack of <logical> consequence of the metaphor—in how he compared the steadfast one and the one giving thanks to the course of the firmament into the sea. He appears to be a stupid man on account of having made a comparison with the steadfast one, because there <only> appeared to have been a kind of falling of the firmament so that it was merged into the sea, <but> it is as distant from the sea in the night as it is from the land at noon.

9.6] Likewise in the Chapter of *Mary*⁴ he said about the inhabitants of paradise that *they have in it a sufficiency of food both morning and evening* (19:62). This statement suggests that in paradise there are separate hours, even though you Muslims say there will be there neither sun nor moon nor night.⁵ Again in the Chapter of *Hūd*⁶ he says that *They will continue in paradise as long as the heavens and earth endure* (11:108). According to you who believe that heaven and earth will pass away in the resurrection,⁷ they⁸ will be in paradise only until the resurrection.

9.7] Likewise in the Chapter of *Elaara*⁹ he introduces God saying,¹⁰ *We created you; afterwards we formed you, and we said to the angels: Adore Adam* (7:11). Tell <us> how he first

¹ *Sūrat Luqmān*, the Sūrah (31) of Luqmān.

² The Qur'ān has *al-fulk* here—"the ship," but the author (as the immediately following discussion of the verse indicates) and the translators have wittingly or unwittingly read this as *al-falak* which looks just like *al-fulk* in unvocalized Arabic and means "the celestial sphere" (hence the Latin *firmamentum*).

³ On my translation of *de suis mirabilibus* as "some of His miracles" see my commentary to 11.6 ("some of the rocks placed there") below.

⁴ *Sūrat Maryam*, the Sūrah (19) of Mary.

⁵ I do not know the origin of this statement.

⁶ *Sūrat Hūd*, the Sūrah (11) of Hūd.

⁷ I do not know the origin of this statement.

⁸ I. e., those inhabiting paradise.

⁹ See 9.3 ("Elaraf") above.

¹⁰ See 3.4 ("impersonating God") above.

formauerit? Item digniores angeli qui spiritus sunt Adam qui terreus est: quomodo eum adorabunt? Idem eodem capitulo: *O vniuersitas hominum et spirituum, nonne uenerunt uobis nuntii ex uobis, et ad homines quidem uenerunt multi homines prophetae?* Quod autem ad spiritus uenerint spiritus prophetantes potius videtur somnium quam res gesta.

9.8] Item {251r} in fine Capituli *Elmaiede*,¹ id est de "mensa:" *Cum dixerit Deus, O Iesu fili Mariae, tu dixisti hominibus, "reputatis me et matrem meam duos deos praeter Deum?"* quasi diceret, "vos homines Christiani malefacitis." Sed hoc est vestrum apertum mendatium super² Christianos qui Mariam non deam sed Dei matrem certissime credunt. Similiter mentitus est in Capitulo *Be Fe Alif He* dicens, *Acceperunt sibi monachos et sacerdotes suos inmensa*³ *praeter Deum*. Quia in oriente uocabant sacerdotes et monachos *rabban*, crediderunt simplices illos deos uocari. Sic etiam mentitus est in sermone suo dicente⁴ quod Maria soror

¹ *Elmaiede*] sic *P*²: non liquet *P*

² super] in *P*²

³ in mensa *P*

⁴ dicens *P*²

created and afterward formed? Similarly, the angels who are spirits are more dignified than Adam who is terrestrial: how will they worship him? Likewise in the same chapter: *O totality of men and spirits, have not messengers come to you from among yourselves, and have not many men indeed come to men as prophets* (cf. 7:37-38)? But that prophesying spirits should have come to spirits appears to be a dream rather than a thing which actually happened.

9.8] Likewise in the Chapter of *Elmaiede*, that is of "the Table":¹ *When God said, O Jesus Son of Mary, did you say to men, "Take me and my mother as two gods in addition to God (5:116)?"* as if he were to say, "you Christian men do wrong." But this is your open lie against² Christians who believe Mary to be not a goddess but rather most certainly the Mother of God. Similarly he lied in the Chapter of *Be Fe Alif He*³ saying, *They adopted for themselves their monks and priests as wondrous things*⁴ *beside God* (9:31). Since in the Orient they used to call priests and monks *rabbān*, the simple believed them to be called gods.⁵ So also he lied in his statement which says that Mary the

¹ See 3.3 above.

² The Latin *super* ("above," "on," "about") no doubt translates the Arabic *‘alā* which likewise means "above" and "on," but whose broader spectrum of meanings also includes "against."

³ The *sūrah* (9) cited here is normally known as *al-Tawbah*, "Repentance". The author, however, appears to have referred to it by its common alternate title of *Barā'ah* ("license" or "declaration of immunity") which is the first word of the *sūrah* (see R. Paret, *Der Koran: Kommentar und Konkordanz*, p. 551), and when the translators encountered this they apparently misread the Arabic *r* as *f*. The resulting **bafā'ah* is meaningless, however, so they simply wrote out the names of the letters following the model of those *sūrahs* (e. g. #20: *Ṭa' Ha'*) which are known only by letters of the alphabet.

⁴ The manuscript clearly has *in mensa* ("on a table") here, but this makes no sense whatsoever since the meaning of the verse in Arabic is quite clear: "They have taken their religious leaders (*ahbār*—probably meaning 'rabbis' here, not 'priests' as the author indicates just below) and their monks (*ruhbbān*) as lords (*arbāban*) to the exclusion of God." Reading *in mensa* as *inmensa* ("wondrous things"), as I have done, does not solve the problem perfectly, since it is difficult to see why the translators would have chosen that word to translate *arbāban*, but it is the only reading that makes sense of both the meaning of the verse and the Latin as we have it in the manuscript.

⁵ *rabbān*, which is used a few times in the Qur'ān (3:75, 5:44 and 63), is a Syriac word used in Arabic especially by Jacobites and Catholic Syrians with the

Moisi et Aaron fuit mater Domini nostri Iesu Christi, inter quas fuerunt anni pene mille quingenti quinquaginta.

9.9] Item in Capitulo Mariae—non est aliquis nostrum¹—: O tu Machomete et sotii vel quicumque, estimabat enim sibi ipsi dictus Machometus quod non uadat ad eam,² id est paenam inferni de qua ibi loquitur: *Et hoc est, inquit, apud Deum tuum destructio determinata*; et post, *Liberabimus eum qui Deum timuerit, et dimitemus transgressores in ea quasi cadauera*. Et est nota apud eos historia ubi dicitur quod Machometus dixit sine dubio, “Deus omnem creaturam hominum pellet in Gehennam—regem, priuatum, etiam prophetam destinatum. Etiam si haberet homo in die illa opera salubria septuaginta prophetarum non existimaret euadere ab horrore Gehennae.” Huic {251v} autem sermoni contradicit in fine Capituli Prophetarum ubi inducit Deum dicentem, *Quoniam hii quibus a nobis bona praecesserunt, illi*

¹ non est aliquis nostrum] quidam uestrum transibunt per ipsum P²

² O tu. . . ad eam] Tu Machomete scilicet et sotii ac quicumque te sequentur aestimabat enim apud seipsum dictus Machometus quod non iret ad eam P²

sister of Moses and Aaron was the mother of our Lord Jesus Christ, between which <two Marys> there were almost one thousand five hundred and fifty years.¹

9.9] Likewise in the Chapter of Mary²—she is not anyone of us³—, O you Muḥammad and <his> followers or whoever, that very Muḥammad presumed about himself that he does not go to it, that is to the punishment of the fire <of hell> about which he speaks there: *And that is*, he says, *a destruction fixed according to God*; and afterwards, *We will set free him who fears God, and we will send away the transgressors in these near-cadavers* (cf. 19:71-72). And the account is known among them where it is said that Muḥammad without doubt said, “God will drive every creature among men—a king, a private person, even a chosen prophet—into Gehenna. Even if a man on that day⁴ has <done> the salutary works of seventy prophets he will not suppose <that he> will escape the horror of Gehenna.”⁵ He contradicts this statement at the end of the Chapter of the Prophets⁶ where he introduces God saying,⁷ *That these to whom good things have been sent ahead from us, they are removed at a distance from that*

meaning of “teacher” or “master.” It was thus a title for clerics and monks (see G. Graf, *Verzeichnis arabischer kirchlicher Termini*, p. 50). The reason why the simple might believe that Christians called their leaders gods is spelled out clearly and correctly by the thirteenth-century Latin missionary Riccoldo da Monte di Croce, who had been to Iraq and met Oriental Christians; after paraphrasing the *Liber denudationis*’ remarks here in his own work he then explained that “Chaldean Christians and all Oriental Christians for honor’s sake call bishops and religious *rabbān* which means “master” . . . But in the Arabic language *rabb* is a name of God which means “Lord” in an absolute sense . . . Muḥammad believed, therefore, that Christians were calling them gods” (Riccoldo, *Contra legem Sarracenorum* 9, p. 101, ll. 41-46).

¹ Mary the mother of Jesus is said in the Qur’ān to have been the daughter of ‘Imrān who was the sister of Moses and Aaron (see 66:12). Cf. al-Qūṭī in al-Khazrajī 7, p. 36, and Riccoldo’s *Itinerarium* 33.10, p. 137 where Muḥammad is similarly accused of lying about Mary.

² See 9.6 above.

³ I. e., “not the St. Mary known to Christians.”

⁴ I. e., Judgement Day.

⁵ I do not know the source for this statement.

⁶ *Sūrat al-Anbiyā’*, the Sūrah (21) of the Prophets.

⁷ See 3. 4 (“impersonating God”).

sunt ab illa paena elongati, nec eius strepitum audient. Vbi est ergo verbum praecedens quod et de¹ textu Alchorani et de² historicis comprobatur?

9.10] Item dicitur in Capitulo de Vacca, *Quando diximus angelis, "Adorate Adam," adorauerunt. Diabolus non restitit nec obediuit, sed superbiuit.* Illud autem reiterat in locis quamplurimis, sed contradicit in Capitulo *Elquef*³ dicens, *Cum dixerimus angelis, "Adorate Adam," Sathan ex spiritibus—elgen*⁴ —*erat et corruptus est in praecepto Domini.* Hoc autem factum est quoniam Sathan non fuit de *elgen*, quos dicunt intermedios inter caelestes spiritus et infernales; vel secundum alios dicuntur spiritus uiliores quos in regione subterranea quasi cum antipodibus confirmant⁵ habitare.

9.11] Item in Capitulo *Elkamar*, id est Lunae: *Aproinquauit hora et partita est luna*, id est "scissa in partes" ut exponunt. Omnes conuenerunt in hac expositionis narratione, quod Machometus sedebat una noctium cum suis, cumque respiciens uideret lunam propinquam coniunctioni dixerunt ei discipuli, "Ostende nobis portentum quod nobis mirabile uideatur;" erexitque caput et innuit lunae duobus digitis, indice et medio, et ait ad lunam, "Scindere per medium." Luna {252r} et scissa est in duas partes et cecidit, una medietas super Montem Ebikais, id est

¹ quod et de] hoc et ex *P*²

² de *exp.* *P*²

³ Elcaph *P*²

⁴ Elegen *P*²

⁵ confirmant *P*²: continuant *P*

punishment, and they will not hear the rumbling of it (21:101,02). Where therefore is the preceding statement which was proved both from the text of the Qur'ān and from the histories?¹

9.10] Likewise it is said in the Chapter of the Cow,² *When we said to the angels, "Worship Adam," they worshipped. The Devil did not stand firm and did not obey, but rather he was proud* (2:34). Now he repeats that in very many places,³ but he contradicts <it> in the Chapter of *Elquef*⁴ saying, *When we said to the angels, "Worship Adam," Satan was from among the spirits—elgen⁵—and was misled in the commandment of the Lord* (18:50). But this happened because Satan was not from among *elgen* whom they say are intermediaries between the heavenly and infernal spirits; or, according to others they are called the viler spirits whom they affirm to dwell in the subterranean region as if among the antipodes.

9.11] Likewise in the Chapter of *Elkamar*, that is "of the Moon":⁶ *The hour approached and the moon was divided* (54:1), that is, "cut into parts," as they explain. They all have agreed in this narrative of explanation, that Muḥammad was sitting on a certain night with his <followers>, and when, looking about, he saw the moon near an astronomical conjunction the disciples said to him, "Show us a sign that will seem miraculous to us." And he raised up <his> head and gave a sign to the moon with two fingers, the index and the middle, and said to the moon, "Be split through the middle." And indeed the moon was split in two parts and fell, one part on Mount Ebikais,⁷ that <mountain>, that is,

¹ I. e., "What has happened to the idea expressed just above and proved by the Qur'ān and Ḥadīth that every man will be driven by God into Gehenna?"

² See 6.3 above.

³ See e.g. Qur'ān 7:11, 18:50.

⁴ *Sūrat al-Kahf*, the Sūrah (18) of the Cave.

⁵ The Arabic here reads that Satan (*Iblīs*) was *min al-jinn*: "from among the Jinn." The translators rendered *al-jinn* by *spiritus* and then, apparently because they were aware that there is a difference between Christian spirits and Islamic Jinn—as they indicate in the sequel—, they wrote *elgen*, the transliteration of *al-jinn* to make clear that they did not mean *spiritus* in the Christian sense.

⁶ *Sūrat al-Qamar*, the Sūrah (54) of the Moon.

⁷ I. e., Mt. *Abū Qubays*, a mountain near Mecca.

talis qui imminet ciuitati Mesques, ex una parte, et alia medietas super alium qui Mons Rubeus appellatur situs ex alia parte ciuitatis. Istud miraculum posuit in Alchorano suo.

9.12] Hoc est autem de maximis et stupendis mendatiis. Quando enim miraculum de sole factum est sub Ezechia, Babilonii intelligentes venerunt vt congratularentur Ezechiae. Quando in passione Christi factum est, non latuit Athenis philosophantes qui ob miraculum fecerunt aram ignoto deo. Vbi uero habet Machometus testimonium de historiis gentium? Nusquam enim hoc

which is near to the city of Mecca on one side, and the other half on another <mountain> which is called the Red Mountain¹ located on the other side of city. He placed this miracle in his Qur'ān.²

9.12] This, however, is among the greatest and most stupendous of lies. For when the miracle of the sun occurred in the time of Ezechial, the learned Babylonians came to congratulate Ezechial. When it happened³ during the passion of Christ, it was not unknown to the philosophers at Athens who, on account of the miracle, made an altar to the unknown god.⁴ But where does Muḥammad have any testimony from the histories of the nations?

¹ As far as I know there was and is no mountain near Mecca called "Red Mountain," though Riccoldo, in his abbreviated version of this same argument against this miracle likewise refers to a *mons rubeus*; see *Itinerarium* 33.14-16, p. 137.

² The early Ḥadīth collections and Qur'ānic commentaries all contain traditions which set out the basic elements of the occurrence narrated here to explain the mysterious words of 54:1: Muḥammad is with a group of his followers or the people of Mecca who ask for a miracle; Muḥammad points at the moon which suddenly splits, the pieces of it falling on Mt. Abū Qubays or near or behind it. (See al-Bukhārī 65 on Sura 54:1; 1; Muslim 50 [ṣifat al-qiyāmah wa-al-jannah wa-al-nār]; 17, pp. 143-45; Ibn Ḥanbāl 1. p. 447, 3. p. 207, 4. pp. 81-82; al-Ṭabarī on 54:1; 27, pp. 84-87; al-Zamakhsharī on 54:1; 4, pp. 430-31.) This incident, however, is also discussed by the contemporary Spaniard Qāḍī 'Iyāḍ (d. 1149) in his enormously popular *Shifā'*, 1. 4. 10; 1, pp. 396-400, where he gives a typical version of it. Surprisingly some of the detail included here, but missing from the earlier Ḥadīth collections, such as Muḥammad pointing at the moon with his index and middle finger (*bi-iṣba'ihī al-mustā wa-al-sabbābah*) can be found in one of the several commentaries on the *Shifā'*; see Aḥmad ibn 'Umar al-Khafājī (d. 1659), *Nasīm al-Riyāḍ fī sharḥ shifā' al-Qāḍī 'Iyāḍ*, 3, p. 2. The *Quadruplex reprobatio* refutes this miracle at some length using language that suggests that *Liber denudationis* influenced it; see fols. 154ra-b. Cf. also both al-Khazrajī 79 & 91, pp. 104, 116-17 and al-Qurṭubī, pp. 348-50 where this miracle and its circumstances are also discussed at some length.

³ I. e., another "miracle of the sun" as recorded in Mt 27:45.

⁴ Pseudo-Dionysius asserted that the Babylonians did observe Ezechiel's miracle and thought him to be equal to God as a result; he also claimed to have seen the eclipse of the moon in Egypt during Christ's passion; see Pseudo-Dionysius, *Ad Polycarpo*, PG 3:1080-82. I have found no source claiming that a similar witnessing of the eclipse inspired the Athenians to build their famous altar. The connection between this altar and Pseudo-Dionysius is quite suggestive however (cf. Act 17:19-34).

ostendere poterit. Saltem in hoc non potuisset latuisse, quia multa milia ad Sarracenismum fuissent conuersi homines.¹

9.13] Iterum cum luna dicatur mater humoris ita quod ipsum mare inmutationibus lunae vehementer eleue[n]tur,² omnes medullae animalium et hominum, pisces in conchiliis et medullae unicor<nu>um luna a lumine minorata minuuntur. Scissa igitur luna tanta esset³ confusio fluctuum maris, tanta destructio in terra, ut mundus periclitatus esset, nec signum istud maris aut terrae latere potuisset habitatores.

9.14] Iterum cum certum sit quod luna non habet aliquid de natura corporum grauium, unde si etiam scissa esset cadere non poterat. Si enim in aethere ignis diuideretur, magis {252v} ascenderet quam descenderet: quanto⁴ magis illud quod est de uera essentia cadere nullatenus potuisset. Sed potius lunam totam scissam circulariter moueri operteret.

9.15] Denique non sicut *caseri*⁵ aut quaedam mola scissa in duobus montibus altrinsecus prope positis teneretur, cum

¹ conuersi homines] conuersa hominum *P*^{2a}; et hominum *supra post* quia multa milia *transp.* *P*^{2b}

² eleuetur *P*²

³ fuisset *P*²

⁴ tanto *P*²

⁵ casri *P*²

Indeed he was never able to show this.¹ In any case it could not have escaped detection in this <connection> since many thousands were the men converted to Islam.

9.13] Again, since the moon is called the mother of liquid² to such an extent that the sea itself is violently raised by the changes of the moon, all the innermost parts of animals and men, fishes in shells and the innermost parts of the unicorns would be weakened if the moon were diminished in light. Therefore if the moon were cut there would be so much confusion of the waves of the sea, so much destruction on land, that the world would be imperiled, and this <miraculous> sign of sea or earth would not have been able to be concealed from the inhabitants.

9.14] Again, since it is certain that the moon does not have anything of the nature of heavy bodies, in that case, if indeed it were divided, it would not be able to fall. For if a fire in the aether were divided, it would ascend more than descend: how much more would that which is of the true essence <of fire>³ in no way have been able to fall. But rather it was necessary for the whole moon to move in a circular fashion once it had been divided.

9.15] Finally, it⁴ would not have been held, like *caseri*⁵ or some divided millstone, on two mountains placed nearly over

¹ The contemporary Spanish Muslims Qāḍī 'Iyāḍ and al-Qurṭubī in very similar passages (see commentary to 9.11) both respond to this sort of argument, citing traditions that indicate, for example, that the people of Samarqand witnessed the splitting of the moon and pointing out that since this miracle happened at night when most people are asleep, it probably was not widely observed.

² "mother of liquid" (*mater humoris*) is a typical Arabic idiom meaning that the moon has power over liquid. The literal translation of such idiomatic expressions involving "mother" (*umm*) can also be seen in other Latin translations of scientific works from Arabic. See P. Hitti, *The History of the Arabs*, 10th ed., p. 579.

³ I. e., the moon. In the Ptolemaic cosmology of the Middle Ages, the moon was considered to be "pure, unadulterated fire;" see C. S. Lewis, *The Discarded Image*, p. 96.

⁴ I. e., the moon.

⁵ This word appears to be the transliteration of some substantive form of the Arabic root *KSR* meaning "to break" or "to fracture"; one possibility is that the text had *lā mūhla al-kisratayn*, "not like two chunks (or fragments)" written hastily so that the translators took *kisratayn* to be **kisirī*, a word they rightly did not recognize, so they transliterated it.

praelunaris corporis magnitudine duae partes illius iuxta Philosophum sextam partem terrae totius aut multas regiones occupassent. Sed Machometi grossior¹ intellectus, et fallax imaginatio nesciuit tantum² mendacium palliare.

9.16] Iterum retulit Etcum (?)³ quod⁴ Abbas⁵ dixit: “Audiui Machometum dicentem quod decem et octo uicibus luna maior est uniuerso.” Quomodo ergo duo montes duas lunae medietates poterant continere?

9.17] Item dicit historiographus uester nomine Seffian Elthouri quod Aiesse vxor Machometi dixit, “Audiui Machometum dicentem quod nullus de filiis Adam moritur, quin ad eum tumultum, quando homines a tumulto discedent, ueniant duo angeli, quorum unus uocatur Monquer et alius Nequir—quos possumus dicere Neganem et Deneganem. Et accipiunt mortuum si fuerit masculus per barbam, si faemina per capillos; et residere facient in institis et reuiuiscet sicut prius. Et dicent ei, ‘Quis est dominus tuus? et quis est propheta tuus? et quae lex tua?’ Si responderit, ‘Deus est Dominus meus, et Mahumet {253r} propheta meus, et Sarracenismus lex mea,’ aperient circa caput eius fenestram protendentem vsque ad paradisum, et dicent ei, ‘Odora et olfacito spiritum paradisi, et delectare in omnibus cibis

¹ grossior] rudis *P*²

² tantum] tale ac *P*²

³ retulit Etcum] retulit et cum *et verba haec rep. P*

⁴ Iterum . . . quod] Immo iterum ac iterum illud retulit et cum quod *P*²

⁵ Albas *P*

against each other, since in magnitude the two parts of that prelunar body, according to the Philosopher,¹ would have occupied one-sixth part of the whole earth, or many regions. But the intellect of Muḥammad was rather crude, and <his> deceitful imagination did not know how to conceal so great a lie.

9.16] Again Etcum related what Abbas said: "I heard Muḥammad saying that the moon is eighteen times bigger than the world."² How, therefore, could two mountains have contained two halves of the moon?

9.17] Likewise your historian named Seffian Elthouri³ says that Aiesse⁴ the wife of Muḥammad said, "I heard Muḥammad saying that none of the children of Adam dies but that two angels, one of whom is called Monquer and the other Nequer⁵—whom we are able to call Denier and Refuser—, come to him entombed, when the <living> men go away from the tomb. And they take the dead person by the beard if he is a male and by the hair if a female, and they will make <him> reside on narrow bands, and he will come to life just as before. And they will say to him, 'Who is your lord? and who is your prophet? and what is your religion?' If he responds, 'God is my lord, and Muḥammad⁶ is my prophet, and Islam is my religion,' they will open near his head a window stretching out all the way to paradise, and they will say to him, 'Smell and breathe in the breeze of paradise, and enjoy all

¹ I. e., Aristotle; I have found no source for the following statement in his works, but see his *De caelo* 2.14, 297^b14-298^a20.

² I know of no source for this statement.

³ I. e., Sufyān al-Thawrī (d. 778), theologian, Traditionist, and mystic; see EI¹ 4:500-02.

⁴ See 7.2 above.

⁵ I. e., *Munkar* and *Nakīr* the two angels who are said in Islamic tradition to examine the dead regarding their religious beliefs and, if necessary, punish them in their tombs. The explanation of the names given in the next lines is probably false since it is unclear what the names mean. See "Munkar wa-Nakīr," EI² 7:576-77 [art. A. Wensinck] and "Adhāb al-ḡabr," EI² 1:186-87 [art. A. Wensinck - A. Tritton] and next note but one.

⁶ In the Latin text Muḥammad is spelled *Mahumet* here, as it often is in medieval and early Modern French (cf. the first laisse of *The Song of Roland*). Elsewhere in the ms. it is unvaryingly spelled *Machometus* in medieval-Latin fashion.

et potibus eius usque in diem iuditii.' Si responderit, 'Ignoro Sarracenisum et Machometum,' ita uerberabunt eum ut faciant descendere ad terram spum<e>am, et iterum facient eum ascendere, et aperient fenestram protendentem usque ad ignem aeternum, et sic erit usque ad diem resurrectionis." Quod¹ mendatium patet omnibus qui uident mortuos putrescentes.

9.18] Iterum nos dicite ubi est paradisus. Iterum dicit in Capitulo *Elameram*,² *Paradisus*, inquit, *latitudo eius caeli et terra*. Quomodo ergo posset esse in terra uel in caelo, cum fuerint septem caeli latitudo eius. Et³ quanta est ergo longitudo eius? Aut quomodo uerum uidebitur quod in sarcofagis comedant et bibant qui iam sunt putrefacti et incinerati?

9.19] Item in Capitulo *Elaaraf*: *Quicumque non dixerit licitum esse ornatum et suauiam anathema sit*. Et indixit uobis⁴ ieiunium unius mensis in anno in quo comedetis a declinatione solis usque ad ascensum aurorae: "Angariemini <* * *> si aliter non potestis in scissura dactili." Qui hoc non fecerit anathema sit. Et

¹ quod] hoc P²

² Elamran P²

³ Et exp. P²

⁴ Et indixit uobis] Indixit item uobis P²

the food and drink of it until the day of judgment.' If he responds, 'I know not Islam and Muḥammad,' then they will beat him in order to make <him> descend to the foaming earth, and they will make him ascend again, and they will open a window stretching out all the way to the eternal fire, and thus he will be <there> until the day of resurrection." This lie is obvious to all who see putrifying dead men.¹

9.18] Again, tell us where paradise is. He says again in the Chapter of Elameram,² *Paradise*, he says, *the width of it is the heavens and the earth* (3:133). How, therefore, was it able to be on the earth or in heaven, when the seven heavens would have been the width of it?³ And what is the length of it? Or how will it appear true that those who already have putrified and been burnt should eat and drink in sarcophagi?⁴

9.19] Likewise in the Chapter of *Elaaraf*:⁵ *Let whoever does not say that adornment and agreeable <food> is licit be anathema* (cf. 7:32). And he prescribed for you a fast of one month in a year in which you eat from the going down of the sun until the rising of dawn: "May you be compelled <* * *> if otherwise you are not able in the divide of a date."⁶ Who does not

¹ The description in this paragraph of the examination of the dead by *Munkar* and *Nakir* is very similar to accounts in traditional Islamic sources; these events are not mentioned in the Qur'an but are widely discussed in Tradition. It is worth noting that the names of the two angels are late additions to the Traditional accounts and are only mentioned once in the authoritative Ḥadīth collections. See "Munkar wa-Nakir," EI² 7:576-77 (art. A. Wensinck), L. Gardet, *Dieu et la destinée de l'homme*, p. 250, and al-Tirmidhī 8 (janā'iz), 70; 4, p. 25.

² *Sūrat Āl 'Imrān*, the Sūrah (3) of the Family of 'Imrān.

³ The Qur'an, just like medieval-Christian tradition, taught that there are seven heavens; see 41:12.

⁴ In this sentence the author, like most anti-Islamic polemicists (cf. al-Qūfī's brief comments in al-Khazrajī 9, p. 38), attacks (rather disingenuously) the Islamic view that those in Paradise will eat and drink; see e.g. Qur'an 47:15, 77:41-43.

⁵ See 9.3 above.

⁶ The part of this sentence from *if/si* on is the end of a famous ḥadīth in which Muḥammad tells his followers that they will save themselves from the fire if they do charity "even if with a half of a date (*bi-shiqq tamrah*)." The translators read *shiqq* (= "half") as *shaqq* which means "divide" or "crevice" or "fissure" since both words look the same in unvocalized Arabic. See al-Bukhārī 97. 36. 4, and cf. A. Wensinck, *Concordance* 1:280 for many more references. How this ḥadīth fits in this context is not clear; as I have indicated there seems to

in Capitulo Vaccae: *Estote solliciti vt impregnetis mulieres in mense uestri ieiunii.*

9.20] Et huic operi¹ uocabunt in paradiso, et habebunt pulchras et electas, ut in Capitulo *Yesin*: *Hodie*, inquit, {253v} *domini paradisi sunt fructificantes*. Quaesitum fuit a magno eorum theologo, cui nomen Elhassen Elbassari, quod est² illud opus. Et respondit, “coniunctio maris et foeminae.” Narratur etiam de isto eodem quod dixit quod longitudo instrumenti mulieris de hiis quae sunt in paradiso erit *berid imberid*, quae est dicta de equo in equum³ deffatigato ad recentem,⁴ et uirga uirilis elongabitur ad illam mensuram. Et quia Sarracenus non poterit baiulare, angariabit septuaginta de Iudaeis et septuaginta de Christianis ut portent illas uirgas. Si de paradiso equorum et mulorum et

¹ Et huic operi] Huic etiam operi P²

² esset P²

³ post equum add. recenter P²

⁴ ad recentem exp. P²

do this is anathema. And in the Chapter of the Cow:¹ *Be careful that you impregnate women in the month of your fast* (cf. 2:187).²

9.20] And they will devote themselves to this work in paradise, and they will have beautiful and chosen women, as in the Chapter of *Yesin*:³ *Today, he says, the lords of paradise are fruitful* (36:55).⁴ What that work is was asked of a great theologian from among them, whose name was Elhassen Elbassari.⁵ And he responded, "the joining of male and female."⁶ It is also related about this same man⁷ that he said that the length of the instrument <for impregnating> a woman from among those who are in paradise will be *berid imberid*,⁸ which is said about a horse recently exhausted in <another> horse, and the manly rod will be elongated to that measure. And because a Muslim will not be able to carry the burden, he will compel seventy from the Jews and seventy from the Christians to carry those rods. Even if it were a

be a lacuna before *if/si*.

¹ See 6.3 and its commentary above.

² This is a distortion of the Qur'an's Arabic which means something like "It is permitted to you to have sexual relations with your wives on the night of the fast."

³ *Sūrat Ya' Sīn*, the *Sūrah* (36) of *Yā Sīn* (another *sūrah* referred to only by letters of the Arabic alphabet).

⁴ The Latin translation of the verse is rather problematic: *domini* translates *aṣḥāb*, which is possible, but rather misleading, since *aṣḥāb al-jannah* here probably means "the possessors of the garden", i. e., those allowed to enter paradise; *fructificantes* is the translators' wild stab at *fākihūna*, "the happy, merry ones" (their bizarre translation arises from the fact that the word for "fruit" coincidentally shares the same root).

⁵ I. e., al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī (d. 728), famous preacher and mystic—not theologian—of the Umayyad period in Baṣrah; see EI² 3:247-48.

⁶ I do not know the source for this statement.

⁷ Presumably al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī.

⁸ "*berid imberid*" is probably a corrupt transliteration of *mazīd al-mazīd*, an idiom meaning "the greatest possible extent or length"—a meaning which suits the unseemly context. The translators could easily have mistaken the two *m*'s for *b*'s and the two *z*'s for *r*'s yielding *berid elberid*, this transliteration then suffering further distortion—as foreign words regularly did—in successive Latin copies.

asinorum uel quorumlibet brutorum ageretur, vile esset etiam talia cogitare.

9.21] Quis unquam Prophetarum talem uitam duxit, aut talia in ieiunio obseruari praecepit—uidelicet, ut angarientur ut luxuriarentur ut a uespera in auroram comedant?¹ Nunquid sic uixit Iohannes Baptista, Helias, Daniel, et Hieremias? Quis unquam talem sperauit paradisum ubi cognoscent pulchras et electas mulieres quas uocant *elhour*? Et quid fiet de uxoribus eorum? Quis cognoscet eas? Alchoranus nihil determinat de eis.

9.22] Ferturque de Machometo quod tria uoluerit de hoc mundo, uidelicet mulieres, et suauia odora in delitiis, et orationes horarum. Primo posuit mulieres quas maxime appetebat, et² secundo posuit delicata in epulis; ultimo posuit orationem quasi uilius inter omnia. Uos {254r} tamen apud³ uos dicitis orationem esse quasi columnam legis.

9.23] Item dixit in Capitulo *Elaaraf*, *Ipsi quaerent a uobis de hora*—scilicet iudicii—, “*quando debeat anchorari?*” *Dic quoniam scientia eius apud Deum meum. Non*⁴ *revelabit horam eius nisi*

¹ augurientur. . . comedant] satiarentur ac luxuriarentur et a uespera in auroram comedere *P*²

² et *exp.* *P*²

³ apud] inter *P*²

⁴ non] nemo *P*²

question of a paradise of horses and mules and asses or any other of the brutes, it would be vile even to think such things.

9.21] Who among the prophets ever led such a life, or ordered such things to be observed in fasting—manifestly, that they be compelled to indulge themselves so that they eat from dusk to dawn? Did John the Baptist, Elijah, Daniel, or Jeremiah ever live thus? Who ever hoped for such a paradise where they will have carnal knowledge of beautiful and choice women whom they call *elhour*?¹ And what will happen to their women? Who will have carnal knowledge of them? The Qur'ān makes no determination about them.

9.22] It is told about Muḥammad that he wanted three things from this world, namely women, pleasant spices in delightful food, and the prayers of the hours.² He placed women whom he especially desired first, and he placed delicacies in sumptuous meals second; he placed prayer last as if it were the basest³ of them all. Nevertheless you say among yourselves that prayer is just like a pillar of the law.⁴

9.23] Likewise in the Chapter of *Elaaraf*⁵ he said, *These same ones will seek from you regarding the hour*—that is, of judgement—, ‘*when might it be anchored?*’⁶ *Say that the knowledge of it is with my God. None but He Himself will reveal the*

¹ I. e., *al-ḥūr* (s. *al-ḥūrīyah*), the “houris” or wide-eyed virgins of paradise mentioned several times in the Qur'ān; they are to be the companions of the blessed. See 44:54; 52:20; 55:72; 56:22 and W. Watt, *Bell's Introduction to the Qur'an*, pp. 161-62.

² Cf. the ḥadīths in which Muḥammad says that “women, perfume, and making joy in prayer” are pleasing to him; see Ibn Ḥanbal 3, p. 199.

³ The Latin text has the comparative “baser” (*uilius*) here rather the superlative as the sense requires; but as in several other instances (see commentary to 10.3 below) this is probably the translators’ erroneous translation of the Arabic elative form which serves as both comparative and superlative depending on the construction.

⁴ The daily prescribed prayers are, of course, considered to be one of the five “pillars of the law” or “pillars of faith” in Islam, I. e., among the essential elements of belief and practice.

⁵ See commentary to 9.3 above.

⁶ The Arabic of the Qur'ān says “when will be the anchoring (*mursāhā*) of it (I. e., of judgement)?” meaning, “at what time has God fixed the hour of it?”

ipse. Idem dicit in Capitulo *Lo<cqu> eman*.¹ *Apud Deum*, inquit, *est scientia horae*. E contrario fertur in historiis aprobat Machometus dixisse, de uia cuiusdam dicti Abimassar, antequam transissent centum anni quod nihil uiuens esset in superfitie terrae, nec est aliquis de suis sequacibus qui dubitauerit fore² resurrectionem in fine centum annorum. Nos autem a tempore illo iam sumus in quarto centenario.

9.24] Item dixit in Capitulo *Eleueam*,³ *Dixit Deus: Dic: "praeceptum est mihi ut primus effitiar Sarracenus,"* et dixerat⁴ in principio quod omnes qui fuerant ante eum praecesserant eum ut fierent Sarraceni. Quomodo igitur fuit ipse primus? Similiter in Capitulo Iona: *Dixit Moises*, inquit, *populo suo*, "*O popule, si*

¹ Locman *P*²: Loeman *P* (vid. Locquemen *supra* 9.5)

² fore *P*²: forte *P*

³ Eleueam *P*

⁴ et dixerat] dixerat autem *P*²

hour of it (7:187).¹ He says the same thing in the Chapter of *Loc-queman*:² *With God, he says, is the knowledge of the hour* (31:34). On the other hand Muḥammad is reported in verified accounts, on the authority of³ a certain Abimassar,⁴ to have said that before one hundred years had passed away nothing would be living on the surface of the earth,⁵ and there is no one among his followers who doubted that the resurrection would be at the end of one hundred years. But we are already in the fourth century from that time.

9.24] Likewise he said in the Chapter of *Eleneam*,⁶ *God said: Say: "it is commanded to me that I become the first Muslim"*, (6:14), although⁷ he had said at the beginning⁸ that all who had been before him had preceded him in becoming Muslims. How therefore was he first? Similarly in the Chapter of *Jonah*:⁹ *Moses*

¹ The awkward Latin of this last sentence literally means "He will not reveal the hour of it except He Himself," and is the result of the translators' word-for-word translation of *lā yujallihā li-waqtihā illā huwa* which means "No one but He will reveal it in its time." I have adjusted the English translation accordingly. N. b. that *P*² intuited what the meaning should be and emended *Non* to *Nemo*.

² See commentary to 9.5 above.

³ "on the authority of" translates the peculiar Latin phrase *de via* which almost certainly is the literal translation of *min ʔarīq*, an idiom whose two constituent words correspond precisely to *de* and *uia*, but whose meaning is "by way of", or "through"; thus it can stand in place of *an* in an *isnād* to mean "on the authority of" and is used particularly to single out a key link in the chain of authorities in an *isnād*.

⁴ I. e., Abū Masʿūd; see next note.

⁵ This is a fairly close translation of a ḥadīth related on the authority of Abū Masʿūd. Ibn Ḥanbal records several slightly different versions; see Ibn Ḥanbal 1, p. 93, and 2, p. 121

⁶ *Sūrat al-Anʿām*, the Sūrah (6) of Livestock.

⁷ The Latin has *et* (= "and") here, but, as in certain other passages, this *et* probably translates an Arabic *waw* of preceding circumstance which would be translated "when" or "although"; this latter obviously makes better sense in this context and I have adjusted the translation accordingly.

⁸ It is not clear what beginning is being referred to here: the beginning of the Qurʾān? the beginning of Muḥammad's prophetic career? The ensuing remarks make clear that it is not the beginning of the sūrah just cited (6) which says no such thing.

⁹ *Sūrat Yūnus*, the Sūrah (10) of Jonah.

uere credentes fueritis Deo, in ipso confidite si Sarraceni fueritis.” Cum igitur constat recepisse populum Isrrael cui Moises imperabat, sic omnes fuerunt Sarraceni. Sed sibi ipsi contradicit in Capitulo *Elaaraf*. Cum timeret Moises ne Deus destrueret eos propter peccata populi, orauit dicens, *Tu es possessor noster. Tu dimitte nobis et miserere, quia tu es melior indultorum;*¹ *scribeque nobis in mundo isto bonum et in alio, quia iam Iudaizauimus tibi*—quod {254v} est in Hebreo *hodna eleka* et in Arabico scribitur *hodna elek*. Vides igitur falsitatem—immo falsam de secta sua iactantionem²—et sui ipsius contradictionem.

9.25] Item refert in Alchorano quod Deus dixerit ei, “O Machomete, *dic adiutori: ‘peto Deum elfelak de malo quod creauit et de malitia laenonis cum intensus fuerit et spuentionum innodatis, qui sunt sortilegi.’*” Praecepit itaque Deus ut uitaret sortilegium,

¹ indulgentium *P*²

² iactantionem (sic) *P*: iactantiam *P*²

said, he says, to his people, "O people, if you are believers in God, have faith in Him, if you are Muslims" (10:84).¹ When, therefore, it is well known that the people of Israel, over whom Moses was in command, accepted <his command>, they all thus were Muslims. But he² contradicts himself in the Chapter of *Elaaraf*.³ When Moses feared lest God should destroy them on account of the sins of the people, he prayed saying, *You are our possessor. Forgive us and have mercy, for you are the better of those who indulge*,⁴ and prescribe for us what is good in this world and in the other, for we have become Jews for you (7:155-56)—that which in Hebrew is *hodna eleka* is also written in Arabic *hodna elek*.⁵ You see, therefore, the falsity—indeed the false boasting about his sect—and the contradiction of himself.

9.25] Likewise it is related in the Qur'ān that God said to him, "O Muḥammad, say to the helper: 'I beseech the God of elfelak⁶ concerning the evil which He created and regarding the malice of the procurer when he is intent [upon me] and [regarding] the entanglements of those who spew out (113:1-4)' who are diviners."⁷ Therefore God ordered that he avoid divination, or

¹ "Muslims" translates the Latin *Sarraceni* which itself renders the Qur'ān's *muslimūn* which, though it does mean "Muslims" in the sense of those who follow the faith of the Prophet, is here used with its primary meaning of "those who submit". In so translating the word "Muslims", however, it is clear that the translators were following the interpretation of the original author.

² I. e., Muḥammad.

³ See commentary to 9.3 above.

⁴ The Qur'ān has *khayr al-ghāfirīna* here, meaning "the best of those who forgive"; the translators wrongly rendered this with the comparative *melior*, meaning "the better."

⁵ From the time of the earliest commentators there has been considerable disagreement regarding what the last part of the verses quoted here means, but many modern scholars of the Qur'ān translate the Arabic *hudnā ilayka* in just the way the Latin translators have: "we have Judaized toward Thee" (cf. R. Paret, *Der Koran: Kommentar und Konkordanz*, pp. 175-76). The author or translators then observe in a curious *non sequitur* that the phrase *Judaizauimus tibi*—"we have become Jews for you"—is the same in Hebrew and Arabic.

⁶ *elfelak* is the transliteration of *al-falaq*, meaning "daybreak" or "dawn" in this verse.

⁷ The commentators explain that "those who spew out" here are, as the author has noted, "sorceresses" or "diviners" (*sawāḥir*); see al-Ṭabarī on 113:4; 30, p. 353, and Ibn Kathīr on 113:4; 4, p. 917.

vel rogare eum fecit Deus ut sortilegium non noceret ei. Iudaei autem arte diaboli in sortilegio [et] uultum cereum uel huiusmodi in puteo deiecerunt acubus plenum, et alio misso extraxerunt de puteo et omnes acus extrahebant non sine dolore Machometi. Quomodo igitur in prophetia sua non cauit, cum inducat in Alchorano Deum de ipso dicentem, “Non ueniet ei uanum quid nec ante nec retro,” et cum iactet Deum imposuisse manus inter scapulas? Quomodo igitur ei potuissent sortilegia nocuisse? Fertur tamen mortuum¹ ex toxicatione quam immisit ei quaedam Iudea in minutione.

¹ mortuum] mortem obiisse *P*²

God made him ask that divination not harm him. But the Jews through an art of divination of the Devil threw a waxen image or something of that kind full of needles into a well, and, with another cast, they pulled it out of the well and extracted all the needles, not without pain for Muḥammad.¹ How, therefore, was he not on guard in his prophecy, since he introduces God² in the Qur'ān saying about <Muḥammad> himself, "An empty thing will not come over him from in front or behind,"³ and since he boasts that God had placed his hands between <his> shoulder blades?⁴ How, therefore, would they been able to harm him by divination? Nevertheless it is reported that he died from a poison which a certain Jewess infused in him in a bloodletting.

¹ There are various versions of just this story recorded in both the Qur'ānic commentaries and Ḥadīth collections as the occasion for the revelation of the last two short sūrahs of the Qur'ān (113 and 114). The kernel of the story is that a Jew named Lubīd ibn al-A'ṣam (or his daughters) once bewitched (*saḥara*) Muḥammad in a manner very similar to the one described here—including the use of needles and a well—and for this reason God revealed these two sūrahs, the reciting of which cured Muḥammad; see, e. g., Ibn Kathīr on 113:4; 4, pp. 917-18, and, for a thorough discussion of the several versions, M. Lecker, "The Bewitching of the Prophet Muḥammad by the Jews," *passim*.

² See 3.4 ("impersonating God").

³ I have not found this passage in the Qur'ān (note that this citation lacks the author's customary sūrah reference); the "empty thing" (*quid vanum*) mentioned here would appear to be divination.

⁴ On the last clause of this sentence see below 12.6 where this incident from Muḥammad's Night Journey is described in greater detail.

DECIMUM CAPITULUM¹ EST DE
HOC QUOD OSTENDIT²
MACHMOMETUM IN INFINITUM ESSE
INFERIOREM CHRISTO QUIA CHRISTUS
AETERNUM UERBUM DEI EST IN
MARIA INCARNATUM.

10.1] {255r} Dicit Machometus in Capitulo Vaccae, *dixit Deus, 'noli quaerere de illis quae sunt in inferno,'* hoc est, de patribus primorum Sarracenorum. Unde fertur dixisse de patre et matre: *utinam scirem quod est opus eorum.*

10.2] Quaerimus ergo de propheta eorum Machometo. Non enim audent dicere quod prophetauerit donec³ post quadraginta annos. Quid ergo faciebat illis quadraginta annis? Non enim poterunt dicere nisi quod indicabat populum in cultura idolorum,

¹ Decimum capitulum *post* in Maria incarnatum *infra transp.* P²

² est de hoc quod ostendit *exp.* P²

³ donec] nisi P²

THE TENTH CHAPTER IS ABOUT THAT WHICH DEMONSTRATES
THAT MUḤAMMAD IS INFINITELY INFERIOR TO CHRIST
SINCE CHRIST IS THE ETERNAL WORD OF GOD
INCARNATE IN MARY.

10.1] Muḥammad says in the Chapter of the Cow,¹ *God said, 'do not inquire regarding those who² are in hell'*, that is, regarding the forefathers of the first Muslims. Whence he is reported to have said about <his> father and mother: *Would that I knew what their work is* (cf. 2:134, 41).³

10.2] We ask, therefore, about their prophet Muḥammad. For they do not dare to say that he prophesied until after forty years.⁴ What, therefore, was he doing for those forty years? Now they will not be able to say anything except that he instructed⁵ the

¹ See 6.3 above.

² The unusual feminine relative pronoun *quae* (*qui* would be the expected form in this construction) appears to reflect the feminine gender of the subject of an earlier part of the Arabic verse which the author is here paraphrasing (see next note): *tilka ummatun qad khalat*, i. e., "this [feminine] is a people [feminine] who have passed away."

³ The two identical Qur'ānic verses apparently quoted here (2:134, 141) actually say "Those are a people who have passed away . . . you will not be asked (*lā tus'alūna*) about what they used to do (*'ammā kānū ya'malūna*)." The author or translators appear to have garbled them and (perhaps willfully) distorted their meaning, changing "those who have passed away" into "those who are in hell." In any case the author is using the verses as he understands them to introduce a theme he will now expand upon at some length: the contrast between Jesus' life and Muḥammad's. The implication of this particular passage is that while Jesus' mother was a holy woman (see 10.4 just below), the Prophet's forebears are in hell. Ramon Martí quotes these same verses with very different intent and in a correct translation in *Explanatio simboli*, p. 455, ll. 13-14, and discusses Muḥammad's relatives in hell in *Quadruplex reprobatio* fol. 158ra, ll. 8-12.

⁴ *The Apology* similarly points out that Muḥammad's prophetic career did not begin until his fortieth year; see *Risālat al-Kindī*, p. 114.

⁵ The Latin text has *indico* here which generally means "to indicate," "to declare," "to make known;" the *Glossarium* (p. 240), however, says that this verb corresponds to the Arabic *KhBR* IV which means "to make known," "to inform," "to relate." "To instruct," therefore, gets across what was very likely the intended meaning.

docens eos iuxta illa legitima—quod dicunt historiae de quarum veritate non dubitatur. Quod si dixerint quod Machometus nunquam fuerit infidelis, falsum hoc esse probabimus per textum Alchorani. Dicitur enim in Capitulo *Ebroha* ipsi Machometo, *Nunquid non inuenit te Deus orphanum, et recollegit errantem, et direxit?* Haec sententia probat prophetam uestrum fuisse errantem.

10.3] Iterum in Capitulo *Elfecep*, id est “adquisitionis:” *Scilicet nos*, inquit Deus, *aperimus tibi aperitionem patentem*—id est adquisiuius adquisitionem—*ut indulgeamus tibi peccata priora et posteriora*. Ad idem est quod Machometus filiam suam duobus idolatris successiue tradidit. Secundo, postquam inceperat Sarracenismus, abstulit a uiro donec factus est Sarracenus. Patet igitur fuisse eiusdem sectae tunc quando idolatrae dederat. Nam ipsemet cum infideli coniunctionem prohibet in Capitulo *Elbaqara*,¹ id est Vaccae, ubi {255v} dicitur: *Nolite fornicari cum participantibus*—id est Christianis mulieribus—*usque dum*

¹ Elbaara p²

people in the worship of idols, teaching them according to those usages—<all of> which the accounts whose truth cannot be doubted say. If they say that Muḥammad never was an infidel, we will prove this to be false through the text of the Qurʾān. For it is said to Muḥammad himself in the Chapter of *Ebroha*,¹ *Did not God find you an orphan, and gather you in when you were in error, and guide you* (93:6,7)?² This statement proves that your prophet had been in error.

10.3] Again in the Chapter of *Elfecep*,³ that is “Acquisition”: *Certainly we*, says God, *opened for you a clear opening*—that is we acquired an acquisition—for you in order that we might forgive you your past and future sins (48:1-2). Bearing on the same point is the fact that Muḥammad successively gave his daughter to two idolaters. Secondly, after the religion of Islam had begun, he took <her> from <one> husband until he became a Muslim. It is clear, therefore, that he was of the same sect at that time when he had given <his daughter> to an idolator. For he himself prohibits sexual intercourse with an infidel in the Chapter of *Elbaqara*,⁴ that is “The Cow,” where it is said, *Do not fornicate with participators*⁵—that is Christian women⁶—until they believe;

¹ *Sūrat al-Duḥā*, the Sūrah (93) of the Brightness.

² Both the *Risālat al-Kindī* (p. 68) and *Quadruplex reprobatio* (fol. 158rb, ll. 10-12) cite exactly this verse for similar purposes.

³ *Sūrat al-Faṭḥ*, the Sūrah (48) of the Conquest (or Opening). Notice that the translators immediately go on to say that *al-faṭḥ* means *adquisitio* (“acquisition”, or better, “increase”), even though they translate this word and the related verb *fataḥa* as “opening” and “to open” immediately below in the verse. This peculiar interpolated explanation of the *al-faṭḥ*, however, suits their possible but clearly unflattering interpretation of this verse.

⁴ See commentary to 6.3 above.

⁵ “participators” here translates the Latin *participantes* which itself wrongly renders the Arabic *al-mushrikāt* in this context. Literally the latter does mean “the female associators” or “the female participants”, but here it is used in the special sense of “polytheists,” that is, “those (females) who associate some other divine being with the one God.”

⁶ This parenthetic observation by the Christian author or the translators is largely unjustified. The Qurʾānic commentaries make clear that the “participators” (*participantes*, *mushrikāt*) mentioned here were not usually understood to be Christians (or any other peoples of the book) but rather polytheists in the strict sense (see, e. g., al-Ṭabarī on 2:221; 2 p. 376-78; but cf. Ibn Kathīr on 2:221; 1, p. 385). In any case Muslim men frequently married Christian women before they converted.

credant; nec etiam cognoscatis masculos participantes donec credant; serui enim credentes participatoribus sunt meliores. Et¹ nota quod hic satis concedit sodomiam omnium mortalium magis flagitosum arrogans et falsius.² Per haec tamen ostendit³ filiam infideli tradidisse cum aequae esset infidelis.

10.4] Videamus igitur e regione quid etiam Alchoranus praedicat de Christo. Dicit enim quod Christus Iesus est verbum Dei et per Spiritum Sanctum incarnatus et a Deo missus. Vnde dicitur in Capitulo *Elmaran*,⁴ *O Maria, Deus annuntians est tibi de uerbo a seipso cui nomen Christus.* Et iterum dixit in Capitulo Faeminarum, id est⁵ *Elnessa, quoniam, inquit, Iesus filius Mariae nuntius Dei est et uerbum eius, et infudit illud Mariae, et spiritus ab ipso.* Dicit etiam Alchoranus quod ipsa Maria virgo concepit, et genuit, et fuit munda et sancta; nec fuit ei admixta aliqua spurcitia uel immunditia.

10.5] Machometum igitur prophetam uestrum, quem audetis praeferre cunctis, Christo dumtaxat verbo tenus conferamus.

¹ Et *exp.* P²

² omnium mortalium. . . falsius] peccatorum maius ac flagitiosius ac detestabilius P²

³ tamen ostendit] etiam ostendit se P²

⁴ Elamran P²

⁵ id est] adest P

and do not have sex with male participators until they believe;¹ *for the believing servants are better than participators* (2:221). And note that he here completely allows sodomy, the most shameful, arrogant, and false² of all mortal sins. Through these things, nevertheless, he demonstrates that he had handed his daughter over to an infidel when he³ was equally an infidel.

10.4] On the other hand, let us see, therefore, what the Qur'ān proclaims about Christ. Now it says that Christ Jesus is the word of God, and that He was incarnate through the Holy Spirit, and that He was sent by God. Whence it is said in the Chapter of *Elmaran*,⁴ *O Mary, God is giving news to you of a word from Himself whose name is Christ* (3:45). And again he said in the Chapter of The Women, that is *Elnessa*,⁵ *that, he said, Jesus son of Mary is a messenger of God and a word of Him, and He infused it into Mary, and He is a spirit from Him* (4:171). The Qur'ān also says that Mary herself conceived as a virgin, and gave birth, and was <still> clean and holy; and there was no filth or uncleanliness mixed with her.⁶

10.5] Let us, therefore, compare Muḥammad your prophet, whom you dare to prefer to all others, to Christ word for word.⁷

¹ As Norman Daniel points out in discussing *Liber denudationis*, this sentence inserted in this verse as if it were part of the Qur'ān is a complete fabrication by the author. Christians, however, frequently accused Muslims of condoning homosexuality; see N. Daniel, *Islam and the West*, pp. 142-43.

² The Latin actually has a series of neuter *comparatives* here modifying *mortalis* (=“mortal,” but here meaning “mortal sin”)—*magis flagitiosum arrogans et falsius* (“the more shameful, arrogant, and false”)—rather than the *superlatives* which both the construction and the meaning require. This is so probably because the translators wrongly translated a series of Arabic *elatives* which serve as both the comparative and the superlative adjective depending on the construction.

³ I. e., Muḥammad.

⁴ *Sūrat Āl 'Imrān*, the Sūrah (3) of the Family of 'Imrān.

⁵ *Sūrat al-Nisā'*, the Sūrah (4) of the Women.

⁶ The Qur'ān testifies to Jesus' virgin birth in 3:47; Mary is also commonly regarded within Islam as sinless in company with the prophets; see G. Parrinder, *Jesus in the Qur'ān*, p. 62.

⁷ Regarding the comparison between Christ and Muḥammad which occupies this and the following two paragraphs, two things should be noted. First, after the initial references to Genesis, this comparison is based almost entirely on what the Qur'ān says about Jesus and Muḥammad: the author wants to use the Islamic revelation against Muslims. Secondly it also forms a summary of many of the

Machometus per ancillam pertinens ad Habraham, si per Hismael descendit. Dum orat Abraham Deum dicens, *Vtinam Hismael uiuat coram te*, audiet Dominum etiam hoc addentem: *duodecim duces generabit; et iterum, hic erit feros homo, manus eius contra {256r} omnes, et manus omnium contra eum*. Christus autem de Abraham cui dictum est, *in semine tuo benedicentur omnes gentes*. Per Isaac descendit cui hereditas promissionum conceditur a quo Hismaelem excludit Deus.

10.6] Machometus nullum ante se praemittit¹ prophetam aut librum attestantem ei. Christus antequam veniat, ante se destinat omnium praeconia prophetarum. Pater et mater Machometi immundi et idolatrae ardent in igne aeterno. Maria munda et sancta concepit Christum. Machometus per quadraginta annos infidelis extitit. Christus sine peccato de uirgine natus fidem Deo semper seruauit. Neque enim Spiritus et Uerbum Dei contrahere peccatum potuit, vel etiam perpetrare. Machometo, ut dicitis, Deus peccata dimittit. Christo uero non² habere peccata fuit nobilius quam dimitti.

10.7] Machometus, requisitus ut per miracula prophetiae suae daret³ certitudinem, nihil attulit. Christus caecos illuminauit, leprosos mundauit, mortuos suscitauit ut non solum prophetam se esse, id est, Dei filium demonstraret. Christus etiam *Apostolis suis dedit potestatem spirituum immundorum et super omnem*

¹ praemittit *P*²: permittit *P*

² non *P*²: *deest P*

³ daret *P*²: dare *P*

If he descends from Ishmael, Muḥammad is related to Abraham through a maid-servant. While Abraham prays to God saying, *Would that Ishmael lived in your presence* (Gn 17:18), he will hear the Lord adding this also: *He will beget twelve princes* (Gn 17:20); and again, *He will be a wild man, his hand against all, and the hand of all against him* (Gn 16:12). But Christ is <descended> from Abraham to whom it is said, *In your seed will all nations be blessed* (Gn 22:18).¹ He descends through Isaac, to whom was conceded the inheritance of the promises from which God excludes Ishmael.

10.6] Muḥammad sends no prophet before himself nor any book witnessing to him.² Before Christ comes, he provides before himself all the proclamations of all the prophets.³ The father and mother of Muḥammad, unclean and idolators, burn in the eternal fire.⁴ Mary, <remaining> pure and holy, conceived Christ. Muḥammad existed as an infidel for forty years.⁵ Christ, born sinless from a virgin, remained faithful to God always. For the Spirit and Word of God was not able to contract sin, much less perpetrate it. As you say, God forgives the sins of Muḥammad. For Christ, however, it was more noble not to have sins than to be forgiven.

10.7] Muḥammad, when asked to give certitude of his prophecy by means of miracles, produced nothing. Christ illuminated the blind, cleansed the lepers, <and> raised the dead⁶ in order to demonstrate not only that he was a prophet, <but>, that is, that he was the Son of God. Christ also gave *power over unclean spirits and over all sicknesses to his apostles* (cf. Mt

points about Muḥammad's unprophetic life (as medieval Christian saw it) which had been discussed at greater length in the previous chapters.

¹ Unlike some of the Biblical quotations earlier in the work, these four follow the Vulgate precisely.

² See 3.1 above.

³ See 3. 5 above.

⁴ See 10.1 above.

⁵ See 10. 2 above.

⁶ Note that these three miracles are specifically mentioned in the Qur'ān in 3:49 and 5:110.

languorem, et ut etiam mortuos suscitarent. Machometus autem nec uisum caecis, nec uitam mortuis unquam reddidit, nec daemones expulit, quia a se utique expulisset. Christus per Spiritum Sanctum semper operabatur et ubique. De uestro autem {256v} propheta dicitis quod sortilegium in ipso cecidit, et quod praestigiatus ipsemet fuerit quod opus quidem Sathanicum est. Item propheta uester dicit se nescire quid de se fiet. Christus sciens omnia quae uentura erant super eum de sua traditione, crucifixione, et resurrectione, discipulis saepius priusquam haec fierent intimauit.

10.8] Denique, inquit *uerbum Dei est quod infundit Mariae, et spiritus ab ipso*. Si¹ permansisset in hoc sermone, nec aliud addidisset, verificata fuisset apud homines Trinitas benedicta, et recepissent legem Christi. Sed euacuauit istud sermone sequenti quo dixit quoniam² *Iesus est apud Deum sicut Adam quem creauit de limo, et dixit ei "esto!" et fuit*. Nota quod auctor Christianus

¹ Si *P*²: sed *P*

² quoniam *exp.* *P*²

10:1),¹ and also <power> that they might raise the dead. But Muḥammad never gave sight to the blind, nor life to the dead, nor did he cast out demons, since he would have undoubtedly cast <one> from himself. Christ always and everywhere worked through the Holy Spirit. About your prophet you say that divination befell him, and that he himself was bewitched which is indeed a Satanic work.² Likewise your prophet says that he does not know what will happen to him.³ Knowing everything which was to happen to him regarding His being handed over, His crucifixion, and His resurrection, Christ often intimated <these things> to the disciples before they came to be.

10.8] Finally,⁴ he⁵ says, <Jesus> is the word of God which He infuses into Mary, and a spirit from Him (4:171).⁶ If he had abided by this statement, and not added another, the Blessed Trinity would have been verified among men, and they would have received the religion of Christ. But he nullified this by the following statement in which he said that *Jesus in the eyes of God is just like Adam whom He created from clay, and He said to Him 'Be!' and He was* (3:59). Note that the author⁷ <appears to be

¹ The Vulgate version of this verse is slightly different from that in the Latin text: "dedit illis potestatem spirituum immundorum, ut eiicerent eos, et curarent omnem languorem. . ."

² See 9.25 above.

³ See 8.7 above.

⁴ From here to the end of the chapter proper the author attempts to argue two things at once, that the Qur'ān really does teach that Jesus was the Son of God, but that it is also full of all sorts of errors. The two verses to be cited just below exemplify these two assertions. The sudden change of style and topic here suggests that this section may be a later interpolation, or at least that the author has borrowed a great deal of this material from another Arab-Christian source. As I contend in chapter three of this study above, this argument strongly resembles certain passages in a ninth-century Palestinian Christian work called *Fi tathlīḥ Allāh al-wāḥid* (cf. *Bibliographie* 12. 4, *Islamochristiana* 1 [1975]: 153) as well as other Oriental Arab-Christian works.

⁵ I. e., Muḥammad.

⁶ This is an accurate translation of this verse except that the subject of this predicate nominative is left out: in the Qur'ān it is *al-masīḥ 'Isā ibn Maryam* ("The Messiah, Jesus Son of Mary") who is called the "word of God" and "a spirit from Him" in this verse.

⁷ Presumably Muḥammad, but perhaps some Muslim polemicist: the foregoing verse was cited in Muslim refutations of Christianity; cf. al-Khazraǧī 29, pp. 57-58.

secundum litteram quam ponit sic: *et spiritus ab ipso*; et quia subiungit quod Trinitas esset verificata apud homines. Uelle uidetur quod dicitur “spiritus” accipi personaliter pro Spiritu qui a Deo est, id est, pro Spiritu Sancto qui *uirginem obumbravit* et iuxta hominem Christum repleuit, quando Deus Pater Verbum suum transfudit in Mariam, id est, incarnari fecit ex Maria.

10.9] Et quod inferius dicit idem—quod uerbum suum Deus et spiritum suum transfudit in Mariam—diuersimode hoc dicitur: “uerbum transfudit” ut incarnandum; “spiritum transfudit” ut praeparaturum uirginem uel materiam carnis assumendam, aut ut impleret iuxta humanam naturam. Quod si dicatur quod Iesus est uerbum Dei et spiritus eius, {257r} id est Dei, oportet quod dicitur “spiritus”¹ accipi essentialiter, ut Filius dicitur Deus de Deo et Spiritus de Spiritu. (Nec² tantam uim hic facimus in uerbo infidelis, nisi quia Christiani contra Sarracenos hoc utuntur uerbo ad destruendam Christi diuinitatem.)

10.10] Sicut enim uerbum quod egreditur de ore corruptibilis hominis corruptibile esse necesse est, sic uerbum quod ab aeterno

¹ spiritum *P*²

² Nec] Non autem *P*²

a> Christian according to the words which he sets forth thus: *and a Spirit from Him*. And <note>, because he adds <this>, that the Trinity would be verified among men. He appears to desire that what is called "spirit" be taken personally for the Spirit who is from God, that is, for the Holy Spirit who *overshadowed the Virgin* (cf. Lc 1:35) and filled out Christ as a man when God the Father transfused His Word into Mary, that is, made <the Word> to be incarnate from Mary.

10.9] And what the same one says later¹—that God transfused His word and spirit into Mary—this is said with various meanings: "He transfused the word" as that which is to be incarnate; "He transfused the spirit" as that which is about to prepare the Virgin or material of flesh to be assumed <by the word>, or in order that <the spirit> fill out <Christ> according to <his> human nature. Now if it is said that Jesus is the word of God and a spirit of Him, that is, of God, it is necessary that what is called "spirit" be taken essentially, as the Son is called God from God and Spirit from Spirit. (And we would not attack so forcefully² the word of the infidel here, except that Christians use this word against Muslims for the purpose of destroying the divinity of Christ.³)

10.10] Now just as the word which goes out from the mouth of a corruptible man necessarily is corruptible, so also the Word

¹ I. e., later in the Qur'ān, for the author is now going to discuss in detail a verse from later in the Qur'ān—4:171. He has just quoted 3:59.

² The *Glossarium*, p.536, says that the Latin text's idiom *facio vim* (literally, "to produce force") used here means *aghlibu* which means "to defeat," "to take possession of," "to conquer," etc. I have taken *facio vim* to mean more or less the latter modified by the presence of *tantam*.

³ This seems to be an allusion to Christians who have watered down Christian teaching on the divinity of Christ to make it more acceptable to Muslims, and have even used verse 4:171 of the Qur'ān to do so. Paulus Alvarus complained of just such a group of Christians in al-Andalus centuries earlier (see his *Indiculus luminosus* 9, *Corpus scriptorum Muzarabicorum* 1:281), and Oriental Arab Christians also complained of this kind of accommodation (see S. Griffith, "The First Christian *Summa Theologiae* in Arabic," pp. 21-22). Since the Mozarabic author appears to be relying on an earlier Oriental-Christian writer here, it is impossible to say whether this statement is evidence of a similar group of Mozarabic theological accommodationists in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. There is, at any rate, no other evidence to suggest that such a group existed in that period.

exiuit, per quod *creauit caelum et terram et intermedia*—ut uerbo utar Alchorani—aeternum esse necesse est: quae sic est sapientia de ipso procedens. Neque enim ante creaturam aliquo uerbo creato usus est Deus. Sed propter¹ infidelem etsi quodammodo coegit ueritas, quod scriptum erat verum exterius dicitur; interius tamen infidelitas induxit male sentire.

10.11] Unde² subiunxit quoniam³ *Iesus est apud Deum, sicut Adam quem creauit de limo, et dixit ei "esto!"* Cum enim⁴ confessi fueritis quod Deus infuderit uerbum suum et spiritum in Mariam, et ex huiusmodi fuerit Christus, et opinemini post hoc quod Christus fuerit ut Adam quem de limo creauit, quomodo⁵ conuenit ut dicatis quod Dei uerbum et spiritus eius limus fuerit? Quia tunc⁶ cum limus non sit nisi de limo, naturam igitur deitatis ponitis limum esse. Absit, absit! Deus enim qui⁷ nec uerbum habet nec spiritum statua est quae nec percipit nec spirat. Nunc autem Deus noster qui *est benedictus in secula* uidet, audit omnia, et habet {257v} uerbum incarnatum de sanctissima uirgine. Et habet spiritum qui uirginem obumbrauit et humanitatem uerbi impleuit.

10.12] Quod si⁸ fueritis opinati quod similiter in Adam fuerit uerbum Dei, similiter et spiritus eius substantia. In hoc est falsitas manifesta quia si Uerbum carni uel limo eius esset unitum, et⁹ Spiritus Dei repleuisset Adam, nunquam Sathanas decepisset

¹ praeter *P*

² Inde *P*²

³ quomodo *M*

⁴ enim] autem *P*²

⁵ post quomodo *add.* itidem *P*²

⁶ Quia tunc *exp.* *P*²

⁷ qui] ille *P*²

⁸ Quod si] Si autem *P*²

⁹ et] etiam *P*²

which went forth from eternity, through which He *created heaven and earth and the things in between* (50:38)¹—as I might use the word of the Qur’ān—must necessarily be eternal: it is the wisdom proceeding from Him. Neither did God use any created word before <the existence of any> creature. But for the infidel, even if truth compels in some measure, what was written will be said to be true in an exterior sense; but still on the interior unfaithfulness led to bad understanding.²

10.11] Whence he³ added that *Jesus in the eyes of God is just like Adam whom He created from clay, and He said to him, “Be!”* (3:59). Now since you have confessed that God infused His word and spirit into Mary, and from this Christ came to be, and you will opine after this that Christ was like Adam whom He created from clay, how is it suitable that you say that the word of God and His spirit be clay? For then, since clay is not <made> but from clay, you propose that the nature of the deity is clay. It is not proper! It is not proper! For a god who has neither a word nor a spirit is a statue which neither sees nor breathes.⁴ But our God who *is blessed in the ages* (Rom 7:25) sees, hears all, and has a Word which was incarnate from the most holy Virgin. And He has a Spirit who overshadowed the Virgin and filled out the humanity of the Word.

10.12] If you were to opine that the Word of God was in Adam in the same way <that it was in Jesus, then> similarly his spirit <would be there> in substance. In this there is obvious falsity since if the Word were united to his flesh or his clay, and the Spirit of God had filled Adam, then Satan never would have

¹ Christians throughout the Islamic world frequently used this Qur’ānic verse as a description of God. See e.g. among Oriental Christians Theodore Abū Qurrah who uses the phrase repeatedly in his *Maymār fī wujūd al-khāliq*, 2. 7. p. 206, l. 45; 2. 10. p. 231, l. 12; in the West the Christian al-Qūṭī similarly uses the phrase; see al-Khazraǧī 2, p. 30, and see chapter one of this study above.

² The exact meaning of these last two sentences is not clear to me.

³ I. e., Muḥammad. Note that this is clearly how Riccoldo interpreted this passage when he paraphrased it in his *Contra legem Sarracenorum* 15, pp. 130-31, ll. 163-79.

⁴ This sentence is strongly reminiscent of a passage of ‘Ammār al-Baṣrī’s *Kiṭāb al-burhān* 5, pp. 46-48; and see chapter three of my study above.

Adam aut deiecisset. Verbo tamen suo dixit Deus Adae, “esto!”— hoc eodem uerbo quo fecit omnia, quod ab aeterno erat apud Deum, quod in sanctissima virgine est incarnatum. Hoc autem¹ Uerbum, incorporatum de virgine, mansit uisibile inter homines et ambulauit super terram; quoniam si sine carne Uerbum et Spiritus fuissent, non quaeret aliquis huiusmodi cernere seu uidere quod² Uerbo hic adiungit Spiritum. Distingue quoniam Uerbum non erat sine carne, id est humanitate, cui Uerbum erat unitum (et non Spiritus³), per quam et⁴ uisibile carnalibus oculis et etiam intellectualibus erat Uerbum. Nec caro illa siue humanitas sine Spiritu erat praesidente et miracula faciente in illa, per quae Spiritus Sanctus intellectualibus oculis apparebat.

10.13] Et⁵ postmodum adiunxit et haec: Fuit itaque Deus perfectus et unus incarnatus cum duabus naturis et duabus uoluntatibus, diuina et humana; et vna per/sona {258r} intra uentrem Uirginis, et post partum Uirginis, et mansionem eius inter homines, et ascensionem eius ad caelum, absque separatione deitatis a natura seu persona: verus filius Dei natus impassibiliter, et coaeternaliter a Deo procedens, sicut est natiuitas caloris ab igne, lucis a sole, intellectus ab anima, splendoris pretiosi lapidis ab eodem, in quibus⁶ omnibus unum alterum non praecedit. Per

¹ autem *P*²: ante *P*

² post quod *add.* autem *P*²

³ et non spiritus *exp.* *P*²

⁴ et *exp.* *P*²

⁵ Et *exp.* *P*²

⁶ quibus] his *P*²

deceived or cast down Adam. By His Word, however, God said to Adam, "Be!"—by this same Word through which He made all things, which from eternity was with God, which was incarnate in the most holy Virgin. Now this Word, embodied from the Virgin, remained visibly among men and walked on the earth; for if the Word and Spirit had been without flesh, no one would seek to discern this or see that which here joined the Spirit to the Word.¹ Notice that the Word was not without flesh, that is humanity, to which the Word (and not the Spirit) was united, through which the Word was visible to the eyes of both the flesh and the mind. And neither was that flesh or humanity without the Spirit which presided and worked miracles in that <flesh>. Through <those miracles> the Holy Spirit appeared to the eyes of the mind.²

10.13] And afterward he³ added these things also: He was, therefore, the perfect and one God incarnate with two natures and two wills, a divine and a human; and <he was> one person within the womb of the Virgin, and after the Virgin's giving birth, and <during> His dwelling among men, and <during> His ascension into heaven, without separation of the deity from the nature or person: the true son of God born impassibly, and coeternally proceeding from God, just as the birth of heat from a fire, light from the sun, intellect from the soul, <and> the precious stone's lustre <radiating> from it, in all of which one thing does not precede the other.⁴ Through Him, therefore, we

¹ I. e., the physical body of Jesus in which the Spirit and Word could be seen by men.

² The second half of this paragraph resembles portions of an anonymous and fragmentary early twelfth-century Latin discussion of the Trinity originating within the school of Laon; see O. Lottin's collection of Latin texts, *Psychologie et morale* vol. 5: *L'école d'Anselme de Laon et de Guillaume de Champeaux*, #282, p. 231, ll. 65 ff. It may represent, therefore, the sort of influence of contemporary Latin-Christian thought over Mozarabic apologetic discussed above in chapter five of my study.

³ It is not clear who the antecedent is here, though the context suggests that it is the author of some work which our author is quoting. As I noted above, much of the argument here resembles that of a ninth-century Palestinian work; see commentary to 10.8.

⁴ These similes are commonplaces in Arab-Christian Christology; see R. Haddad, *La Trinité divine*, p. 115ff.

ipsum igitur certam promissionem habemus de regno Dei, si manserimus colentes eum. Neque fuerimus sicut uos qui statuistis Spiritum Dei et Uerbum eius, quod ab eo est, limum; et dedistis¹ aduersariis uestris intelligere quod Deus summus Spiritus est et Uerbum, et non adoratis huiusmodi, sed colitis deum sine verbo et spiritu.

Sarracenorum obiectio prima.

10.14] Quod si dixerit dicens, "Quomodo subintrare potest intellectum quod ille quem caelum et terra capere non possunt, immo qui omnia capiat, potuerit esse in utero virginis circumscriptus?" Sed² ad hoc responsio est quod Deus immensus carni unitus in utero Uirginis per solam carnem circumscribatur, nullatenus contrata³ infinitate propriae deitatis.

10.15] Sed exempla grossiora crassioribus sensibus adducamus, et primo de⁴ Ueteri Testamento: Intrauit Deus paradisum postquam peccauerat Adam dicens, *Adam, ubi es?* {258v} et audiuit Adam sonitum pedum eius. Intrauit domum Abrahae, cum tamen domus Abrahae non caperet eum, nec tamen ipse desinebat esse quod erat immensus. Sic etiam cum loqueretur Moisi in arbore—rubi—, cum tamen nec rubus cresceret, nec Dei immensitas imminueretur. Non ergo mireris si remanens

¹ Et dedistis] Dedistis autem P²

² sed exp. P²

³ contrariata P²

⁴ de] ex P²

have the certain promise of the kingdom of God, if we continue as worshippers of Him. And we will not be like you who affirm that the Spirit of God and His Word, which is from Him, are clay, and who give your adversaries to understand that the Highest God is a Spirit and Word, and <then> do not worship a <god> of this kind, but rather you worship a god without a word and spirit.

First Objection of the Muslims

10.14] Now if someone should say, “How is it possible to understand that the one whom heaven and earth are not able to contain, the one who, rather, contains all things Himself, was able to be circumscribed in the womb of a virgin?” But the response¹ to this is that the boundless God united to flesh in the womb of the Virgin was circumscribed by flesh alone, the infinity of His own divinity in no way having been diminished.

10.15] But let us bring forth some commoner examples for the ruder senses, and first from the Old Testament: God entered paradise after Adam had sinned saying, *Adam, where are you* (cf. Gn 3:9)? and Adam heard the sound of His feet. He entered the house of Abraham, even though the house of Abraham could not hold Him, and nevertheless He did not cease be boundless (cf. Gn 18:1-8). So also when He spoke to Moses in the tree—the bush—, when nevertheless neither the bush grew, nor was the boundlessness of God diminished (cf. Ex 3:1-10 & Qur’ān 28:29-30).² Do

¹ The Christian author responds to this typical Muslim objection to the Incarnation (cf. al-Qurṭubī, p. 151) in this and the following three paragraphs. On the similarities of his response to passages of other Mozarabic and Oriental Arab-Christian polemics see chapter three of my study above.

² The incident of Moses and the burning bush is recounted in both the Hebrew scriptures and the Qur’ān. But in the former the plant involved was a bramble bush (Vulgate Latin: *rubus*), while in the Qur’ān it was a tree (*al-shajarah*, cf. 28:30). The Mozarabic author here appears to have had in mind the Qur’ānic account, and when the translators encountered his *al-shajarah* they first translated it literally as *arbor*, but then recalled that the Old Testament version spoke of a bramble bush and so parenthetically wrote *rubus* immediately after *arbor*, and then used *rubus* in the following line as well. So familiar was the Qur’ānic version of this story to Arab-Christian authors that they occasionally confused Biblical statements and Qur’ānic statements in quite striking ways, such

immensus, in utero Uirginis per solam carnem circumscribebatur.

10.16] Sed¹ tu, infidelis, non legis tu in Alchorano tuo quoniam *Deus est sedens supra sedem*, et sedes esse describitur supra thronum, et *latitudo throni caelum et terra*?² Et iterum thronus esse dicitur intra sedem, et quod totum illud est supra caelos et terram. Et³ quomodo erunt caeli et terra in spatio sedis, et sedes erit maior, et totum simul super caelos?

10.17] Sed et de narratione nullus uestrum dubitat quod in die resurrectionis cum praeceperit Deus filios perditionis prohici in

¹ Sed] At P²

² terram P

³ Et] At P²

not wonder, therefore, if, while remaining boundless, in the womb of the Virgin <God> was circumscribed by flesh alone.

10.16] But you, infidel, do you not read in the Qur'ān that *God is sitting upon a seat* (cf. 40:15), and the seat is described as on a throne, and the *width of the throne is heaven and earth* (2:255)? And again the throne is said to be within the seat, and all this is above the heavens and the earth.¹ Now how will the heavens and the earth be within the measure of the seat, and the seat be greater, and all at the same time be over the heavens?²

10.17] But also according to an account which none of you doubt,³ <we know> that on the day of the general resurrection when God orders the sons of perdition to be thrown into the fire,

as when the Nestorian Bishop of Tīrhān, ʿĪlīyā I (d. 1049), in the course of listing a variety of Old Testament evidences of the Trinity said that God said to Moses at the burning bush, "I am God; there is no god other than Me; I bring death and I give life." (See the extracts of his *Kitāb uṣūl al-dīn* in Ṣalībāh ibn Yūḥannā al-Mawṣilī's *Asfār al-asrār*, part 2, ch. 2, Vatican City, Vat. Ar. 110, fol. 181v l. 6; cf. *Bibliographie* 22.5, *Islamochristiana* 2 [1976]:208-09.) These words, of course, come not from the Bible, but are found in a variety of places in the Qur'ān (e. g. 2:28, 3:156, 44:8, etc.).

¹ The Qur'ān speaks sometimes of God's *'arsh* (= "throne"), as in 40:15 quoted above (and here translated as "seat" [*sedes*] in the Latin), and at other times of His *kursī* (= "throne"), as in 2:255 quoted just above too (and here translated as "throne" [*thronus*]). There was a great deal of speculation of the kind briefly provided here about the relationship between these two heavenly objects (which were often interpreted allegorically). One ḥadīth, for example, related that the *"kursī* was beneath the *'arsh* . . . and the heavens and the earth are inside the *kursī*, and the *kursī* is in front of (*bayna yaday*) the *'arsh*" (Ibn Kathīr on 2:255; 1, p. 463; cf. Muḥamad ibn Aḥmad al-Qurṭubī on 2:255; 3, pp. 276-78; and "Kursī," EI² 5:509 [art. Cl. Huart (J. Sadan)]).

² The author seems to have meandered from his topic here. Rather than arguing that the Qur'ān demonstrates how God may be circumscribed yet remain unboundless, he here emphasizes the contradictions of the Qur'ān, the topic of his ch. 9 above.

³ "according to an account which none of you doubt": I have translated the Latin here (*de narratione nullus uestrum dubitat*) in this way, rather than the grammatically more likely "none of you doubt about the account," because the sense of the passage as a whole suggests that there was a *ṣifah* clause in the Arabic after *narratione* which, as elsewhere, the translators incorrectly translated (see above, pp. 224-25). If that is the case, it is necessary to understand the phrase as I have done so here.

ignem, clamabit ipse ignis, et dicet, “nunquid plures sunt?” Quantoque plus dixerit, “suntne plures?” tanto plures prohibentur in eum. Et tamdiu clamabit donec Excelsus pedem suum extenderit ad eum et tunc implebitur. Et tunc¹ Deus summus immittet digitum suum in infernum et extrahet ex eo quem uoluerit. Si ergo infernus capere poterit pedem aut digitum Dei, quod tamen est supra intellectum tuum, non est mirum si tuus intellectus non capit quod uterus Virginis intra se habuerit uerbum aeternum {259r}.

Alia obiectio

10.18] Sed quomodo gloriosus Deus dignatus est vituperari aut potuit crucifigi aut mori aut in triduo mortis suae < * * * > qui² regebat caelos et terram? Quibus³ respondebimus quod Christus passione et morte redemit suos ab aeterna morte, nec diuinitas aliquam iniuriam sustinebat quae latebat in carne—sicut⁴ margarita in conchilio, cuius si recte diuidantur aut frangantur,⁵ salua est candida⁶ margarita.

10.19] Sed et⁷ si rex aliquem damnatum igni tradiderit⁸ in loco⁹ ubi non est respiraculum, angelus eidem ad custodiam deputatus intrans cum eo, nunquid igne poterit laedi? Nequaquam. Multo minus ergo diuinitas quae omnino impassibilis est. Siue igitur Christus in utero Uirginis secundum carnem, siue in cruce, siue

¹ Et tunc] Tuncque *P*²

² quis *P*²

³ Quibus] Illis *P*²

⁴ Sic *P*²

⁵ diuidatur aut frangatur *P*²

⁶ post candida add. est *P*²

⁷ Sed et] Sic item *P*²

⁸ tradiderit] trudi iusserit *P*²

⁹ locum *P*²

the fire itself will cry out, and will say, "Are there not more?" And as often as it says, "Are there more?" so often will more be thrown into it. And it will continue to call out until The Most High¹ extends His foot to it and then it will be full.² And then the Highest God will thrust his finger into hell and extract from it whom he desires.³ If, therefore, hell will be able to grasp the foot or finger of God, which, nevertheless, is above your understanding, there is little wonder if your understanding cannot grasp that the womb of the Virgin held the Eternal Word within itself.

The Other Objection

10.18] But how did the glorious God deign to be mocked or <how was He> able to be crucified or die or in the space of three days after His death <* * *> who was ruling <at the same time> the heavens and the earth? To this we will respond that Christ in suffering and death redeemed His <followers> from eternal death, and <His> divinity did not sustain any of the injury which lay hidden in the flesh—just as a pearl in a shell: if <the shells> of it are divided or broken accurately, the pearl is preserved white.

10.19] But again if a king hands over some condemned person to the fire in a place where no breathing can occur, <and> an angel is sent to him for protection and enters <the fire> with him, will <the angel> be able to be injured by the fire? By no means. Much less, therefore, the divinity which is wholly

¹ The contemporary *Latin-Arabic Glossary* says that the Latin *Excelsus* used here corresponds to the Arabic *mutaʿālin* (*Glossarium*, p. 171) which is one of the Islamic divine names meaning "The Most High" or "The Supreme Being."

² This account of the commerce between God and the fire of hell—including God's placing of His foot in its flames—is found in several versions in al-Bukhārī's collection; see 65. Sūrah 50, bab 1. 1-3; 97. 7. 2; and especially 97. 25. 2

³ According to certain ḥadīths God will eventually remove some people from hell to paradise, though I have found no account that specifies that his finger will play the role discussed here; see A. Wensinck, *A Handbook of Early Muḥammadan Tradition*, p. 97.

sub terra, semper Deus sedebat in throno suo, et omnia regens omnibus praesidebat.

10.20] Sed nec Iudaei sua potentia inuito Christo aut improuiso probra et saeua tormenta intulerunt, cum omnia praeuidens et Apostolis praedicens: *potestatem*, aiebat, *habeo ponendi animam meam et iterum sumendi eam, et nemo tollit eam a me, sed ego pono eam a me ipso*. Sed et¹ omnia quae passus est Christus praedicta fuerant a prophetis qui et ipsi nobiles prophetae passi fuerunt a patribus Christi crucifixorum, vt fuerunt Isaias, Hieremias, Ezechiel, et Zacharias filius Ioiade, Hieu filius Anani et Vrias propheta, qui omnes Christi passionem et mortem praefigu/rauerunt, {259v} qua Diabolus amisit imperium mortis.

10.21] Vnde et postea pro Christo mortui sunt mortis eius resurrectionis et ascensionis in caelum testes, Apostoli benedicti, qui multum in Alchorano laudati—dicuntur triumphi Dei et eius praecipui. Cuius² Christi passionis et mortis exemplo pro iustitia passi sunt et postea martirum milia infinita.³ Nec mori vel pati fuit Christo ignominia, cum pati pro iustitia sit potius gloria, et mori pro salute omnium sit charitatis praecipua praerogatiua, et maxime quoniam post humiliationem passionis statim secuta est gloria

¹ Sed et] Quinimo P²

² post cuius add. ergo P²

³ post infinita add. itaque P²

impassible. Whether, therefore, Christ was in the womb of the Virgin according to the flesh, or on the cross, or under the earth, God was always seated upon His throne and was watching over everything while ruling all.

10.20] But the Jews by their power did not inflict disgraceful and savage torments upon an unwilling or unforeseeing Christ, since He foresaw all things and predicted them to the Apostles: *I have the power*, He said, *of laying down my soul and of raising it up again, and no one takes it from me, but rather I lay it down by myself* (cf. Jo 10:17-18). Anyway everything which Christ suffered was foretold by the prophets, and these same noble prophets suffered at the hands of the ancestors of crucifiers of Christ, such as were Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezechial, and Zachariah son of Jehoiada,¹ Jehu son of Hanani,² and Uriah the prophet,³ who all had prefigured the passion and death of Christ, by which the Devil lost <his> dominion⁴ of death.

10.21] Whence also afterward the witnesses of His death, resurrection and ascension into heaven, the blessed Apostles, who are much praised in the Qur'ān—they are called the triumphs of God and His outstanding ones⁵—died for Christ. Afterward, end less thousands of martyrs suffered for justice on the example of the passion and death of that Christ. Neither to die nor to suffer was a disgrace to Christ, since to suffer for justice is, rather, glory, and to die for the salvation of all is the chief privilege of

¹ Who was stoned for rebuking the Israelites in 2 Par 24:20-22.

² A prophet mentioned in 3 Reg 16:1, 2 Par 19:2, 20:34.

³ Uriah son of Shemaiah, whom Jehoiakim had killed in Jer 26:20-23.

⁴ The Latin *imperium* used here could also mean "empire" or "sovereignty," but the *Glossarium* (p. 234) defines it as *sulṭān* or *imrah*, both meaning "authority," "command," or "dominion." I have, therefore, translated *imperium* accordingly.

⁵ The Disciples are considered to be holy men in the Qur'ān and Islamic tradition. Ibn Ḥazm, for example, held that they were holy men (*awliya' Allāh*) whom the Qur'ān praised (*al-Faṣl* 2:90). The peculiar phrase "triumphs of God" (*triumphi Dei*) is a mistranslation of the Qur'ānic description of the disciples as *aṣḥāb Allāh*, "the helpers of God" (3:52); since NṢR IV was considered equivalent to the Latin verb *triumpho*, "to triumph" (see *Glossarium*, p. 518), the translators assumed that *aṣḥāb* was a plural of some word meaning "victory" or "triumph."

resurrectionis et ad caelos ascensionis.

10.22] Nec acceptamus¹ quod in uestris scriptum est narrationibus, quod Iudaei non interfecerunt Christum, sed uisi sunt hoc facere. Absit Deum auctorem esse simulationis tantae! Et scribitis quod² Eba Horeire quaesiuit a Machometo, "Quomodo Iudaei crucifixerunt Christum?" Et subridens Machometus ait quoniam Iudaei maledicti cogitabant crucifigere Christum qui venit ad turbam et dixit, "Quis vestrum accipiet meam effigiem et crucifigetur pro me, et statim habebit paradisum?" Quam³ recepit quidam de turba. Qui dum pateretur *obscuratus est sol, et rupes scissae sunt, et multi surrexerunt de sepulchris suis et abierunt ad domum sanctam, Hierusalem*. In hoc probatum est potius quod tenemus fide firmissima, quia nunquam tam horrenda miracula faceret aliquando Deus pro eo qui saltem non erat propheta vel apostolus, sed pro homine {260r} populari. Sed⁴ facta sunt haec potius quia mundi domino patiente compassae sunt ei nobilissimae creaturae. Et nisi qui patiebatur fuisset viuificator omnium, iam in ipsos⁵ morte deuicta, non surgerent mortui de sepulchris.

¹ Nec acceptamus] Non autem admittimus P²

² Et scribitis quod] Scribitis etiam quod P²

³ post quam add. effigiem P²

⁴ Sed] At vero P²

⁵ ipso P²

charity, and especially because after the humiliation of the passion immediately followed the glory of resurrection and ascension to the heavens.

10.22] We do not accept that which is written in your narratives, that the Jews did not kill Christ, but only appeared to do this.¹ Far be it from God to be the author of so great a deception! Indeed you write that Eba Horeire² asked of Muḥammad, "How did the Jews crucify Christ?" And, laughing, Muḥammad said that the cursed Jews were planning to crucify Christ who came to a crowd and said, "Who among you will take my likeness and be crucified for me, and he will immediately have paradise?" A certain one from the crowd took it.³ And while he suffered the *sun was darkened, and rocks were split, and many rose from their their graves and went to the Holy House*,⁴ Jerusalem (Mt 27:45, 51-53). In this, rather, is proved that which we hold in the firmest faith, for God never at any time would make such wonderful miracles for someone who, indeed, was not a prophet or an apostle, but rather a man of the people. But these things were done, rather, because while the Lord of the world suffered, the most noble creatures suffered with Him. And the dead would not arise from graves, death having now been conquered in them, unless He who was suffering had been the giver of life to all.

¹ Both the Qur'ān and Islamic Tradition hold that Jesus did not die at the hands of the Jews but only appeared to. See e. g. Qur'ān 4:157-58 and chapter four of my study above.

² I. e., Abū Hurayrah (d. 677), Companion of the Prophet; see P. Hitti, *History of the Arabs*, 10th ed., pp. 394, 396.

³ Al-Ṭabarī lists ḥadīths almost exactly like this, *effigies* ("image") here translating the Arabic *ṣūrah* ("image," "likeness"); see al-Ṭabarī on 3:54; 3, p. 289 and on 4:157; 6, pp. 12ff., esp. 14; and cf. Ramon Martí, *Explanatio symboli* 4, p. 478, ll. 14-15.

⁴ The Latin text's *domum sanctam* ("Holy House") translates the Arabic *al-bayt al-muqaddas* (literally "the sanctified house") which is one of the standard Arabic name for Jerusalem. The translators appear to have added *Hierusalem* ("Jerusalem") after translating the phrase literally in order to explain its meaning to their Latin audience.

UNDECIMUM CAPITULUM¹ EST²
DE PEREGRINATIONE
ET LAPIDE NIGRO.

11.1] “Circueant,” inquit, “in domo ueteri vel libera”—videlicet ad fanum de³ Mesques. Dicunt enim narrationes quas historias appellant quod Deus vetustauit et liberam fecit domum illam ex praesentia et manifestatione gigantum in ea. Et hoc quidem factum esse constat quia quidam nobilis, nomine Elagag, illam domum destruxit et principem, filium patruelis Machometis, suspendit super montem Filii Keis. Item post trecentos sexdecim annos gens barbara quae dicitur Elkarametha illam domum ab omni pretioso in ea spoliauit et lapidem nigrum transtulit et abscondit ibi prope Mesquem. Nulla autem vindicta secuta est de omnibus istis. Quomodo ergo domus libertatis a gigantibus est?

¹ Undecimum capitulum *post* et lapide nigro *infra transp.* P²

² est *exp.* P²

³ de *exp.* P²

THE ELEVENTH CHAPTER IS
ABOUT THE PILGRIMAGE
AND THE BLACK STONE

11.1] “Let them circle,” he says, “in the old or free house”¹—that is, at the sanctuary of Mecca. Now the narratives which they call histories say that God made that house endure long and freed it from the presence and manifestation of giants in it.² And indeed it is well known that this occurred because a certain noble, named Elagag,³ destroyed that house and hanged a prince, the son of the cousin of Muḥammad, on the mountain of the Son of Keis.⁴ Likewise after three hundred and sixteen years a barbarous nation which is called Elkarametha⁵ plundered that house of everything precious in it and carried off the Black Stone⁶ and hid it near Mecca.⁷ But no revenge followed for all these things. How therefore is it a house of liberty from giants?

¹ This admonition to circle in or about the “old or free house” (I. e., the Ka‘bah), which introduces the topic of the Ḥajj, is apparently put in the mouth of Muḥammad. Though I do not know its exact source it seems to be related to Qur’ān 2:125, where God commands Abraham to purify the Ka‘bah “for those who perform the circuits around it”, I. e., those completing the standard number of *ṭawāṡ* around the Ka‘bah during the Ḥajj. He refers to this important shrine as “the old house” (*domus uetus*) presumably because of its great age according to Islamic tradition (cf. Qur’ān 3:96). As to why the author calls it “the free house” (*domus libera*) see next note.

² A. Wensinck noted that in one legendary account of the history of the Ka‘bah Quraysh wanted to pull it down but a monster opposed them until God sent a bird which carried the monster off; see his article on “Ka‘bah” in EI¹ 2:589.

³ I. e., Abū Muḥammad al-Ḥajjāj b. Yūsuf (d. 693), a famous and energetic Umayyad governor; see P. Hitti, *History of the Arabs*, 10th ed., pp. 207-08.

⁴ al-Ḥajjāj conquered Mecca in 693. See EI² 4:319. “the mountain of the Son of Keis” (*filius Keis*) is surely the same as Mount Ebikais mentioned above 9.11, I. e., Mount *Abū Qubais* near Mecca, the translators here misreading *Abī* as *ibn*, “son”.

⁵ I. e., al-Qarāmiṭah (the Karmathians), the adherents of a branch of the Ismā‘īlīyah; see EI² 4:660-65.

⁶ I. e., the famous *ḥajar al-aswad*, or Black Stone, inside the Ka‘bah and said to have come from paradise (see the following paragraphs).

⁷ This passage is largely accurate: the Karmathians invaded Mecca in 929 (c.

11.2] Dixit etiam patronus uester quod venit ad uos confringere statuas et uocare ad culturam vnus Dei. Ipse uero statuit in angulo praememoratae domus lapidem quendam nigrum quem praecepit adorari et deosculari a uobis. Quae est, {260v} quaeso, differentia huius lapidis ad statuas vel idola quae uos prohibuit adorare?

11.3] Et iam multiplicauerunt sententias super lapidis istius descriptione. Prima sententia est quia lapis praetiosus sit, et quod Deus obduxit splendorem eius ne illum cerneretis, et¹ si hoc non esset, solem excelleret in splendore et eius minueret actionem. Sed iste² sermo vanus est quia potius miraculum tanti fulgoris meritis uestri Prophetae debuit attestari qui alias nullum miraculum perpetrarat.

11.4] Alii vestrum dicunt quod est dextera Dei et iusiurandum quo peccatoribus repropitiatur. Sed si dextera Dei esset lapis, esset ipse totus lapideus Deus. Alii dicunt quod Deus testem posuerit eum peregrinantibus, sed hoc erat seipsum paruipendere ut non ipsi super uestris peregrinationibus sed lapidi crederetis.

11.5] Alii uestrum dicunt quod Gabriel de paradiso apportauerit³ eum albissimum ad Abraham et Hismael edificantes domum illam, et⁴ tactu infidelium factus est niger. Et huic⁵ respondebimus, “si tactu infidelium ante aduentum Machometi

¹ et] quodque P²

² Sed iste] Iste uero P²

³ portauerit P²

⁴ et] sed quod P²

⁵ Et huic] At P²

11.2] Now your patron said that he came to you to break statues¹ and call for the worship of the one God. But he himself placed a certain black stone in a corner of the above-mentioned house and ordered it to be adored and kissed by all. What, I ask, is the difference between this stone and the statues or idols which he prohibited which he prohibited you from adoring?

11.3] And now they have invented multiple opinions regarding the description of this stone.² The first opinion is that the stone is precious, and that God covered over its splendor lest you discern it, and if this were not so, it would have surpassed the sun in splendor and diminished its action. But this statement is vain because a miracle of so much brightness ought to be attested by the merits of your prophet who performed no miracle at any other time.

11.4] Others of you say that it is the right hand of God and an oath by which there will be atonement for sinners. But if a stone were the right hand of God, He would be a god completely made of stone.³ Others say that God placed it as a witness to pilgrims, but this was to consider Himself of little value with the result that you would not trust in Him during your pilgrimages, but in a stone.

11.5] Others of you say that Gabriel carried it, when it was very white, from paradise to Abraham and Ishmael who were building that house,⁴ and by the touch of the infidels it became black.⁵ And to this we will respond, "if it became black by the

300 years after Muḥammad's time) and carried off the Black Stone which was returned twenty years later. See EI² 4:319, 662.

¹ I. e., "idols," the Latin *statua* used here being the equivalent of the Arabic *wathan* ("idol") according to the *Glossarium*, p. 481.

² In the next few paragraphs the author lists several legends regarding the description and origin of the Black Stone. Except where noted, I do not know their origin.

³ In a rare moment of levity, the translators have indulged in a word-play here with *lapideus Deus* meaning "a lapidary God," or "a God made of stone."

⁴ I. e., the Ka'bah which Abraham and Ishmael were said to have built.

⁵ This explanation is found in a number of slightly different versions in the Ḥadīth collections and commentaries—often the same work provides several minimally different accounts (cf. al-Ṭabarī below). In some the stone descended white from heaven by itself (al-Tirmidhī); in others Gabriel brought it from India (al-Ṭabarī), or from heaven (al-Ṭabarī); it is reported to have been turned black by the offenses (*khaṭāyā*) of mankind (al-Ṭabarī) or the children of Adam (al-

factus est niger, quando venit ergo Sarracenorum gens, quae apud uos dicitur gens pacis et fidei, cum a nonnullis aliis per multa saecula fuerit osculatus? Diu est ex quo fuit;¹ albedini debuit restitui.” Alii de auctoribus aiunt lapidem aliquid habere constellationis quo attrahat de remotis partibus venientes.

11.6] Cum autem fui ibi peregrinus tempore infidelitatis meae, {261r} retulerunt mihi cives ciuitatis Mesques quod in² mane diei festi sacrificiorum, ueniunt ad locum Elmina,³ et habet quilibet septuaginta calculos quibus se impellit[ur] sicut fatuus per dies quatuor, et quicumque⁴ hoc non fecerit non prodet ei peregrinatio. Et tunc omnia cum sanguine sacrificiorum prohiciunt in valles, et reuoluto anno de illis nihil inueniunt. Et est signum quod Deus eleuat in caelum illa quae faciunt, et acceptum est ei sacrificium. Sed istud uerbum unum est de eorum mendatiis quia hoc faciunt inundationes quae etiam de rupibus ibi posit⁵ euellunt; aliquando et in ualles alias defferunt. Quae⁶ uno anno tantae

¹ fuit] suae P²

² in exp. P²

³ Elmuna P

⁴ et quicumque] Quicumque vero P²

⁵ positis] sitis P²

⁶ Quae] Hae inundationes P²

touch of infidels before the coming of Muḥammad, when, therefore, did the nation of the Muslims, which among you is called the nation of peace and faith, come <on the scene>, since it was <obviously> kissed by some other <infidels> through the many centuries? <But, in fact,> it is a very long time from when <the arrival of the Muslims> occurred; it should already have been restored to whiteness.”¹ Other authors say that the stone has something of the constellation² by which it attracts those coming from remote areas.

11.6] Now when I was a pilgrim there in the time of my infidelity, the citizens of the city of Mecca related to me that in the morning of the day of the feast of the sacrifices, they come to the place of Elmina,³ and each one has seventy pebbles with which he strikes himself like a fool for four days, and the pilgrimage does not proceed for whomever does not do this. And then they throw everything, together with the blood of the sacrifices, into the valleys, and when a year has gone round they find none of this. And this is a sign that God raises up into heaven those things which they do, and <that> the sacrifice has been accepted by Him.⁴ But this statement is one of their lies because floods, which even pull up some of the rocks⁵ placed there, do this; sometimes

Tirmidhī); or the polytheists (*ahl al-shirk*, Ibn Ḥanbāl). See al-Tirmidhī 7 (ḥajj) 49; 3, pp. 232-33; Ibn Ḥanbāl 1, pp. 307, 329, 373; 3, p. 66 ff.; and al-Ṭabarī, *Ta’rīkh al-rusul wa-al-mulūk*, series 1, vol. 1, p. 275ff.

¹ I. e., “if the touch of infidels made the stone black, then Muslims are infidels, since the stone is still black and they are the only ones who have kissed it for a long time.”

² As the contemporary *Glossarium*, p. 101, suggests, the Latin *constellatio* used here probably translates the Arabic *ṭālī‘* which means “celestial body” or “star.”

³ I. e., al-Minā near Mecca where some of the events of the Ḥajj take place.

⁴ This brief account of what the author claims to have been his experience on the Ḥajj before his conversion to Christianity is a distortion of some of the events that happen during one part of the pilgrimage. The pilgrims do gather at al-Minā for three days, and they do throw seven (not seventy) rocks at the *jamrat al-‘aqabah* (not at themselves); a large number of animal sacrifices are made (for all this see “Al-Ḥad̲j̲dj,” EI² 3:36). Nothing here, however, proves that the author ever really made the pilgrimage.

⁵ “some of the rocks” translates *de rupibus* which, though a prepositional phrase in Latin, is clearly the object of the sentence, and is doubtless the literal translation of an Arabic phrase such as *min al-ahjār* which likewise is technically

fuerunt in ipso festo quod¹ ipsos cum camelis et hominibus ita asportauerunt² quod non fuit de eis rumor.

11.7] Item de uino et sicera dicit in Capitulo *Elbaqara*,³ id est “vaccae,” *Ipsi quaerent a te super uino et sicera. Dic: “in eis est iniquitas magna.”* Et in Capitulo *Elmaiede*, quod interpretatur “mensa:” *Uinum*, inquit, *et pocula huiusmodi offensio quaedam de operibus Sathanae*, et idem dicitur in Capitulo *Elaharaf*. In his omnibus damnat poculum uini, sed contrarium dicitur in Capitulo *Palmae* vbi dicitur, *De fructibus palmarum et uinearum accipietis inaebriationem et possessionem pulchram*. Ad⁴ idem in Capitulo *Eleneam*:⁵ *Non inuenio in mihi reuelatis vetitum de escis praeter morticinum*⁶ *aut sanguinem effusum aut carnes suillas et quod*

¹ quod] ut *P*²

² asportauerint *P*²

³ Elbacara *P*²

⁴ At *P*²

⁵ Elemeam *P*: Eleueam *P*²

⁶ morticinium *P*²

they <even> carry them off into other valleys. These floods were so great one year during this same feast that they so swept up those things,¹ together with camels and men, that there was no report of them <again> .

11.7] Likewise² he says regarding wine and intoxicating drink in the Chapter of *Elbaqara*, that is “of the Cow,”³ *They will ask of you about wine and intoxicating drink.*⁴ Say: “*in these there is great iniquity*”, (2:219). And in the Chapter of *Elmaiede*, which means “the Table”:⁵ *Wine*, he says, *and such drinks are one of the offenses among the works of Satan* (5:90),⁶ and the same is said in the Chapter of *Elaharaf*.⁷ In all these <statements> he condemns the cup of wine, but the opposite is said in the Chapter of the Palm⁸ where it is said, *You will take inebriation and a beautiful possession*⁹ *from the fruit of the palms and the vines* (16:67). Likewise in the Chapter of *Elneam*:¹⁰ *I do not find in the things revealed to me a prohibition of food other than carrion or poured-out blood or swine flesh and what has been sacrificed to other*

a prepositional phrase but can be the object of a verb and mean “some of the rocks” (cf. the French “du lait” = “some milk”); see W. Wright, *A Grammar of the Arabic Language*, 3rd ed., vol. 2 (Leiden, 1896, rpt. Beirut, 1981), p. 135.

¹ It is not clear what the antecedent to this pronoun (*ipsos*) is; *rupes* (“rocks”) is the likely candidate, but it is feminine in gender.

² The remaining paragraphs of this chapter have nothing to do with the Ḥajj, but rather treat of some apparent inconsistencies in Islamic teachings about alcohol. This is one of several indications that the chapter divisions and titles of the *Liber denudationis* were likely added by someone other than the author.

³ See commentary to 6.3 above.

⁴ “intoxicating drink” (*sicera*) is the thorough (and unexplainable) mistranslation of the Qur’ān’s *maysir* which was an Ancient Arabian game of chance.

⁵ See commentary to 3.3 above.

⁶ The Arabic reads literally, “Wine, *maysir* (see previous note but one), idols, and divining arrows are filth (*rijs*) from among the works of Satan.”

⁷ I have not found any similar verse in *Sūrat al-A‘rāf*, the Sūrah (7) of the Heights.

⁸ See commentary to 5.2 above.

⁹ “beautiful possession” (*possessio pulchra*) translates the Qur’ān’s *rizq ḥasan* meaning “good sustenance.”

¹⁰ *Sūrat al-An‘ām*, the Sūrah (6) of the Cattle.

sacrifica[n]tur alii quam Deo. Igitur {261v} vinum non est prohibitum; per cibum enim et potio accipitur.

11.8] Fecit¹ etiam in eorum historiis quod Abdalla filius Messeoud, cuius Alchoranum dicitur Machometus approbasse, narrat quod, Machometus iturus ad psallendum, quaesiuit, “quid est in uterulo²?” Respondit uinum suave cum aqua munda quo se baptizauit ut psalleret. Dixi itaque ei, ‘quid dicis de potatione eius, nuntie Dei?’ Respondit, ‘licitam eam dico; nec timor in ea nisi prouocaret scotomias et contemptus.’” Sic Eba³ Honeife, theologus orientis, non prohibet uinum nisi hoc⁴ quod inebriat, et postea enumerat nouem alios famosos sequaces illius. Et⁵ omnes filii Elerak non prohibent uinum.

¹ Facit *P*²

² utreolo *P*²

³ Eba] Ebn *corr. P vel P*²

⁴ hoc] eo *P*²

⁵ et] qui *P*²

things than God (6:145). Therefore wine is not prohibited, for a drink <of wine> indeed is accepted as food.

11.8] It happened,¹ moreover, in their histories that Abdalla son of Messeoud,² whose Qur'ān Muḥammad is said to have approved, narrates that when Muḥammad was about to go out in order to pray, he³ asked <him>, “‘What is in the bag?’ He answered <that the bag contained> sweet wine with clean water with which he had baptized himself in order to pray. I therefore said to him, ‘what do you say about the drinking of it, messenger of God?’ He answered, ‘I declare it licit; there is not any fear regarding it unless it provokes dizzinesses and scornings.’”⁴ Thus Eba Honeife,⁵ a theologian of the east, does not prohibit wine other than that which causes inebriation; and later he counted nine other famous followers of him <in this view>. And all the sons of Elerak⁶ do not prohibit wine.⁷

¹ The translators appear to be using the active *fecit* (“it made”) in the sense of the passive forms of the same verb, *fit* and *factum est* (“it happened,” “it came to be”).

² I. e., ‘Abd Allāh ibn Mas‘ūd (d. 635), Companion of the Prophet mentioned above in 6.2.

³ Abdalla must be the subject here despite the fact that the syntax suggests otherwise, for the sense of the passage dictates that the Latin phrase *Machometus iurus ad psallendum* must be understood as a nominative absolute—a construction not found in classical Latin, but common enough in medieval Latin, and corresponding in this case, perhaps, to an Arabic nominal absolute; the sense also requires that Muḥammad be taken as the object of *quaesivit* (“he asked”).

⁴ This “history” appears to be a polemically rewritten version of the ḥadīth in which Muḥammad is presented with two receptacles (*inā’ān*), one containing wine and the other milk, and is asked to choose between them; he chose the one containing milk and this was taken as a further indication that wine was prohibited. See al-Bukhārī 74. 1. 2., and cf. A. Wensinck, *Concordance* 2:79 for other versions.

⁵ I. e., Abū Ḥanīfah (d. 767), the Iraqi founder of the Ḥanafī *madhhab*; see P. Hitti, *History of the Arabs*, 10th ed., pp. 397-98.

⁶ “sons of Elerak” (*filiī Elerak*) is probably a slightly corrupted translation/transliteration of *banū al-Iraqī* (“the sons of the Iraqī”) by which the author probably means the followers of the Iraqī, Abū Ḥanīfah, who together make up the Ḥanafī *madhhab*.

⁷ The Ḥanafī *madhhab* was the most permissive of the four Islamic legal schools on the question of alcohol. They, for example, allowed moderate consumption of alcoholic *nabīdh*, or wine, for medical purposes. See “Khamr,” EI² 4:995-96 (art. A. J. Wensinck).

DUODECIMUM CAPITULUM¹ EST²
DE FICTIONE
IMPROBABILISSIMAE VISIONIS.

12.1] Item dixit in Capitulo Filiorum Isrrael, *Laus ei sit qui transire fecit seruum suum vna nocte ab oratorio Elharam*—quod interpretatur “latrocinium,”³ quae est domus Mesque vbi corpus Machometi est⁴—*usque ad oratorium remotissimum*—quae est domus sancta in Hierusalem—*circa quam benediximus*.⁵

¹ Duodecim capitulum *post* improbabilissimae visionis *infra transp.* P²

² est *exp.* P²

³ quod interpretatur “latrocinium” *om. M*

⁴ vbi corpus Machometi est *om. M*

⁵ *post* benediximus *add.* et cetera *M*

THE TWELFTH CHAPTER IS ABOUT
THE COUNTERFEITING OF THE
MOST IMPROBABLE VISION

12.1] Likewise,¹ he said in the Chapter of the Children of Israel,² *Praise be to Him Who made His servant travel one night from the oratory of Elharam*³—which means “robbery,”⁴ which is the house of Mecca where the body of Muḥammad is—to the most remote oratory—which is the Holy House in Jerusalem—around which we have given thanks (17:1).⁵

¹ The whole of this chapter is devoted to Muḥammad’s famous Night Journey into heaven, which the author has already mentioned twice above (4.6, 9.25). Because of its overwhelming resemblance to many other accounts of this event, I have little doubt that the story given here is based largely on some authentic Islamic version. Many of the features of this account—the dialogue-style narration, the description of al-Burāq, the trip through the levels of heaven, the encounter with angels and Moses, the negotiation with God over the number of daily prayers, etc.—are found in numerous ḥadīths preserved in a variety of texts. See, e. g., Muslim 1 (Imān), vol. 2, pp. 209-33 and Qāḍī ‘Iyād’s *al-Shifā’* 1. 3. 2; 1, pp. 232ff. But the most likely source for all of this, including the annotated quotation of verse 17.1 which follows immediately, is a Qur’ānic commentary, for in most commentaries numerous traditional versions of the *mirāj* are quoted; see “Mirādī,” *El*² 7:97-100 [art. B. Schriede (J. Horowitz)], and esp. Ibn Kathīr on 17:1; 3, pp. 5-41, but also al-Ṭabarī on 17:1; 15, pp. 1-18, and Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Qurṭubī on 17:1; 10, pp. 203-12. N. b. that all of this chapter, from *in capitulo* (12.1) through *secuti sunt* (12.9), is reproduced in Riccoldo’s *Contra legem Sarracenorum* 14, pp. 122-24, ll. 5-71. For a critical edition and study of a later (13th-century) and much longer Latin version of the Night Journey, likewise based directly on Arabic sources, see E. Werner, *Liber scale Machometi: Die lateinische Fassung des Kitāb al mi’rāj* (Düsseldorf, 1986).

² *Sūrat Banī Isrā’īl*, the Sūrah (17) of the Children of Israel.

³ “the oratory of Elharam” (*oratorio Elharam*) translates the Arabic *masjid al-ḥarām*, “the Holy Mosque” which, as the translators indicate, is in Mecca and from which the journey into heaven was said to have begun.

⁴ This is an unwarranted interpretation of what “Elharam” means (see previous note) which may have been added by a later copyist since this whole phrase is lacking in *M* (see critical apparatus).

⁵ Verse 17:1 cited here is the verse that gave birth to the tradition that Muḥammad was taken up into heaven. The author’s or translators’ parenthetical explanations are, despite one obvious distortion (see previous note), correct and

12.2] Expositio huius sententiae est quod Machometus vna die psallebat horam matutinalem; cumque {262r} finiuisset dixit hominibus, “O vos,” inquit, “homines, intelligite: sero postquam recessi a uobis, uenit ad me Gabriel post psalmodiam uespertinam ultimam, dixitque mihi, ‘O Machomete, praecepit tibi Deus ut eum uisites.’ Cui dixi¹ ‘Et ubi eum uisitabo?’ Et dixit Gabriel, ‘In loco ubi est.’ Adduxitque mihi iumentum maius asino et minus mulo, et nomen eius Elberak; dixitque mihi, ‘hunc ascende et equita usque ad domum sanctam.’

12.3] “Cumque curarem ascedendere, refugiebat iumentum, dixitque ei, ‘sta firmiter, quia Machometus est qui te curat² ascendere.’ Respondit iumentum, ‘Nunquid missum est pro Machometo?’ Cui Gabriel, ‘vtique.’ Ait iumentum, ‘non

¹ dixi *M*: dixit *P*

² sic etiam *M*: cupit *P*²

12.2] The explanation of these verses¹ is that one day Muḥammad was praying at the hour of morning prayer;² and when he had finished he said to the men, "O you men," he said, "know this: at a late hour after I left you, Gabriel came to me after the last vesper chant,³ and he said to me, 'O Muḥammad, God has commanded you to visit Him.' I said to him, 'And where shall I visit Him?' And Gabriel said, 'In the place where He is.' And he led to me a beast of burden bigger than an ass and smaller than a mule, and its name was Elberak;⁴ and he said to me, 'Mount this <beast> and ride all the way to the Holy House.'⁵

12.3] "And when I was trying to mount, the beast fled, and <Gabriel> said to him, 'stand still, for it is Muḥammad who tries to mount you.' The beast answered, 'It has <already> been sent for Muḥammad?'"⁶ Gabriel answered him, 'Undoubtedly.' The

probably were taken from a commentator's paraphrase of the verse; see chapter four of my study above.

¹ This phraseology—*expositio* ("explanation") is, according to the contemporary *Glossarium*, p. 180, equivalent with the Arabic *ta'wīl* ("explanation") used so frequently in Qur'ānic exegesis—suggests that the author is here paraphrasing a Qur'ānic commentary; see chapter four of my study above.

² Probably the *ṣalāt al-ṣubḥ*, "the prayer of the dawn," the first of the five prescribed prayers. Note that the translators have used the language of Christian liturgy here: *Machometus . . . psallebat horam matutinalem*, literally, "Muḥammad psalm-chanted the hour of matins."

³ Probably the *ṣalāt al-ʿishā*, "the prayer of evening," the last of the five prescribed prayers. Once again the translators have used Christian-liturgical language here: *psalmodia uespertina*, literally, "the vesper psalm-singing."

⁴ I. e., al-Burāq the beast of burden which carried Muḥammad to Jerusalem; it was usually—as here—said to be "larger than an ass and smaller than a mule"; see, e. g., Muslim 1 (Imān); 2, p. 210-11 and Qāḍī 'Iyāq, *al-Shifā* 1. 3. 2.; 1, p. 232; and cf. Riccoldo's *Itinerarium* 35.5, p. 139 where the same description in almost exactly the same language occurs.

⁵ I. e., Jerusalem; see 10.22 above.

⁶ The peculiar Latin sentence *Nunquid missum est pro Machometo?* ("It has already been sent for Muḥammad?") is an attempt to translate the Arabic question which, in most accounts of the Night Journey, is asked several times of Gabriel in regard to Muḥammad on their way up through the heavens: *wa-qad bu'itha ilayhi?* (or sometimes *wa-qad ursila ilayhi?*) which means, "Has [the prophetic call] already been sent to him?" See, e. g., al-Ṭabarī on 17:1; 15, p. 4; Ibn Kathīr on 17:1, 3. pp. 6, 8; Qāḍī 'Iyāq, *al-Shifā* 1, p. 233; and cf. "Mi'radj," EI² 7:99 [art. B. Schrieke (J. Horovitz)].

permittam eum ascendere nisi prius rogauerit Deum pro me.' Ego autem intercessi pro iumento apud Deum meum, ascendique iumentum. Et gradiebatur insidente me tenui gressu, collocabatque ungulam¹ pedis in horizonte uisus sui, sicque ueni ad domum sanctam in spatio minori quam ictus oculi compleatur; eratque Gabriel mecum, et adduxit me ad rupem in domo sancta, dixitque Gabriel, 'Descende quoniam ab rupe ascendes in caelum.'

12.4] "Descendi et Gabriel iumentum Elberak cum circulo ad rupem firmauit et portauit me in² humeris suis usque ad caelum; cumque ueniremus ad caelum mundi, pulsauit Gabriel ad portam; dictumque est ei, 'quis est?' Respondit, 'ego sum Gabriel.' Dictumque est ei³ iterum, 'quis est tecum?' Respondit, 'Machometus.' Et dixit portarius,⁴ {262v} 'Nunquid missum est pro eo?' Respondit Gabriel, 'etiam.'⁵ Aperuitque nobis portam, et⁶ uidi gentem ex angelis, et bis flectendo pro eis genua fudi orationes. Et post accepit me Gabriel et duxit ad caelum secundum. Et fuit distantia inter caelum illud secundum et caelum mundi⁷ itinere⁸ quingentorum annorum."

¹ ungulam *M* et sic etiam fontes (ḥāfir: vid. com.): virgulam *P*

² super *P*²

³ quis est? Respondit . . . ei] *M*: om. *P*

⁴ portarius] hostiarius *P*²

⁵ Gabriel: etiam] *M*: etiam Gabriel *P*

⁶ et] Tunc *P*²

⁷ secundum . . . mundi] unum celum et alterum *M*

⁸ itinere *M* et sic vid. *P*: uniuersi *P*²; sed vid. 4.6 sup.: inter quos erat distantia iter quingentorum annorum

beast said, 'I will not permit him to mount unless he first prays to God for me.' So I interceded with my God for the beast, and I mounted the beast. And, while I was seated <upon him>, he stepped along with a fine pace, for he was placing the hoof of <each> foot on the horizon of his <field> of vision,¹ and thus I came to the Holy House in a space <of time> smaller than that which a wink of an eye might fill.² And Gabriel was with me, and he led me to a rock in the Holy House, and Gabriel said, 'Dismount, for from the rock you will ascend into heaven.'

12.4] "I dismounted and Gabriel secured the beast Elberak to the rock with a circle <of rope>³ and carried me on his shoulders all the way to heaven. And when we were arriving at the heaven of the earth,⁴ Gabriel knocked on the gate, and it was said to him, 'Who is it?' He answered, 'I am Gabriel.' And again it was said to him, 'Who is with you?' He answered, 'Muḥammad.' And the gatekeeper said, 'It has <already> been sent for him?' Gabriel answered, 'indeed yes.' And he opened the gate for us, and I saw a nation of angels, and by bending <my> knees twice for them, I poured out prayers. And afterwards Gabriel took me and led me to the second heaven, and the distance between that second heaven and the heaven of the earth was a journey of five hundred years."⁵

¹ Many ḥadīths recounting the Night Journey observe that al-Burāq's gait was such that he placed his hoof "on the extreme edge of his field of vision (*'inda muntahā ṭarafihī*)" or "at the edge of his range of vision (*'inda madd baṣarihi*)" and so they came to Jerusalem in an instant; cf. Ibn Kathīr on 17:1; 3, pp. 8, 11, 20.

² Riccoldo uses exactly the same expression in *Itinerarium* 35.5, p. 139: "in minori spacio quam in ictu oculi."

³ The Latin *circulus* ("circle") probably translates the Arabic *ḥalqah* (= "ring," "circle"). Many ḥadīths relate that when Gabriel and Muḥammad arrived in Jerusalem one of them tied up al-Burāq with the *ḥalqah* which had been used for this same purpose by earlier prophets who likewise had ridden the beast; cf. Ibn Kathīr on 17:1; pp. 8, 19, 20; and Qāḍī 'Iyād, *al-Shifā'* 1, p. 232.

⁴ The Latin *caelum mundi* ("heaven of the earth") literally translates the Arabic *samā' al-dunyā*, both terms referring, in medieval Muslim and Christian cosmology, to "the terrestrial heaven," the lowest of the seven heavens. Many of the Traditional descriptions of the arrival of Gabriel and Muḥammad at *samā' al-dunyā* are very similar to this one (see, e. g., Ibn Kathīr on 17:1, 3; p. 8).

⁵ A number of ḥadīths report that there is a journey (*maṣṭrah*) of 500 years between each heaven; cf. Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Qurṭubī on 2:255; 3, p. 276.

12.5] Et sicut in primo dixit se pulsasse et respondisse¹ sicut in primo² usque septimum caelum—intellige de omnibus caelis³—, in quo septimo caelo describit se uidisse populum angelorum.⁴ Longitudo uniuscuiuslibet angeli erat instar mundi multis mille uicibus, quorum⁵ aliquis habebat septingenta milia capita, et in quolibet capite septingenta milia oculi, et septingenta mille milia ora, et quodlibet os habebat septingentas mille linguas⁶ laudantes Deum septingentis mille milibus idiomatibus. Et respexit vnum angelum flentem, et quaesiuit causam fletus eius, et respondit, “culpa sunt.” Ipse autem orauit pro eo.

12.6] “Sicque,” inquit, “Gabriel mandauit me alteri angelo, et ille alteri, et sic donec starem coram Deo et tribunali eius; tetigitque me Deus manu sua inter humeros usque adeo ut usque ad medullam spinae dorsi mei manus eius frigiditas perueniret. Dixitque mihi Deus, ‘imposui tibi et plebi tuae quinquaginta orationes.’ Cumque descendissem ad quartum caelum, consuluit mihi Moises quod reascenderem ad alleuiandum, quia populus {263r} meus ad⁷ tantum non posset. Et primo reditu obtinui remissionem de⁸ decem usque ad quartam uicem, et quinto reditu a quarto usque septimum non remanserunt nisi quinque orationes. Cumque Moises dixisset, ‘neque hoc poterunt,’ ego prae confusione totiens ascendendi non plus ascendi, sed rediens ad

¹ respondisse *MP*²: *vid. respondite P*

² sicut in primo] sic per omnia in singulis celis *M*: sic fecisse ait *P*²

³ intellige de omnibus caelis] *om. M*

⁴ *post* angelorum *add. quodque P*²

⁵ quorum] horum *P*²

⁶ et quodlibet. . . linguas] et in quolibet ore septuaginta millia linguas *M*

⁷ ad *exp. P*²

⁸ de *exp. P*²

12.5] And¹ just as in the first <heaven>, he said that he knocked and responded just as in the first <heaven> all the way to the seventh heaven—understand that <he did this> for all the heavens²—in which seventh heaven he describes himself to have seen a people of the angels. The length of each angel was the equal of the world many thousand times over; a certain one of them had seven hundred thousand heads, and in each head there were seven hundred thousand eyes, and seven hundred thousand thousand mouths, and each mouth had seven hundred thousand tongues praising God in seven hundred thousand thousand languages. And he saw one angel weeping, and he asked about the cause of his weeping, and he answered, “sins are <the cause>.” He then prayed for him.

12.6] “And thus,” he³ says, “Gabriel commended me to another angel and he to another and so forth until I was standing before God and His tribunal; and God touched me with His hand between <my> shoulders so that the coldness of His hand penetrated all the way to the inner core of the spine of my back. And God said to me, ‘I have imposed upon you and your people fifty prayers <each day>.’ And when I had descended to the fourth heaven, Moses advised me that I should reascend for the purpose of alleviating <this burden> because my people would not be able to do so much. And on the first return <to God> through the fourth time, I obtained a remission of ten <prayers each time>, and after the fifth journey from the fourth <heaven> to the seventh, there only remained five <daily> prayers. And when Moses had said, ‘and they will not be able to do <even> that,’ I did not ascend again on account of the confusion of ascending so many times,⁴ but rather, returning to Elberak, I rode

¹ Unlike the previous and following paragraphs recounting the *miʿrāj*, this one is a paraphrase by the Christian author, rather than a direct translation, and may well be an interpolation by the author drawn from another account of these events.

² This parenthetic explanatory phrase which is lacking in *M* (see critical apparatus) may well be an interpolation by a later Latin copyist.

³ I. e., Muḥammad.

⁴ This explanation of how there came to be five obligatory daily prayers in Islam is found in other accounts of the Night Journey; see the passages from Muslim cited in the commentary to 12.1 and esp. Ibn Kathīr on 17:1; 3, pp. 15, 18.

Elberak, equitai rediens ad¹ domum in Mesque, et tempus² omnium istorum minus quam decima pars noctis.”

12.7] Plus de uisione ista est illud quod dimisimus,³ dicit auctor,⁴ quam quod narrauimus.⁵ Cumque⁶ hanc fictionem Machometus narrasset gentibus vniuersis, sexaginta millia hominum a lege eius recesserunt. Cumque dicerent ei, “Ascende in caelum nobis cernentibus de⁷ die, et uideamus angelos occurrentes,” non recognouit⁸ falsitatem suam, sed ait, “Laus Deo meo! Nunquid aliud sum ego quam unus hominum et nuntius?”

12.8] Sic et in Capitulo Prophetarum narrat de quaerentibus miracula fieri ab eo. Sic dixerunt de Machometo scilicet, *Auscultasti somnia, sed blasphemias concinasti, uel forte poetizas. Venias ad nos saltem cum miraculo uno quemadmodum missi sunt et priores*. Respondit, *Destruimus*,⁹ inquit Deus, *ciuitates*¹⁰ *ante eos qui non crediderunt. Nunquid ipsi credent?* Et quomodo expetent ab eo miracula? Respondebat eis, “Quoniam qui praecesserunt uos non crediderunt miraculis, nec etiam uos miraculis creditis, nec creditis nisi per gladium.”

12.9] Audite ergo, Machometici, si Alchoranum {263v} verificatis! Ipse est qui affirmat Machometum nunquam fecisse miraculum. Longe autem plures fuerunt quos consumpsit gladius quam illi qui gratis eum secuti sunt.

¹ ad exp. P²

² et tempus] Tempus autem P²

³ est illud quod dimisimus exp. P^{2a} sed verba haec rest. P^{2b}

⁴ actor M

⁵ post narrauimus add. sed illud demisimus P^{2a} sed verba haec exp. P^{2b}

⁶ Cumque] Cum autem

⁷ de] in P²

⁸ recognouit] agnouit P²

⁹ sic M et sic etiam Alchoranus (ahlaknā): om. P

¹⁰ post ciuitates add. sunt P²

<away>, returning to the house¹ in Mecca, and the time for all of this was less than the tenth part of the night.”

12.7] The part of that vision which we have not included, says the author,² is longer than that which we have narrated. And when Muḥammad had narrated this fiction to all the nations, sixty thousand men abandoned his religion. And when they said to him, “Ascend into heaven for those of us trying to make a determination about the day <of judgment>, and let us see the angels coming to meet <us?>,” he did not recognize their falsity, but said, “Praise be to my God! Am I anything else than one man and a messenger?”³

12.8] So also in the Chapter of the Prophets⁴ he tells about those asking him to make miracles. Thus they said about Muḥammad, manifestly, *You listened to the dreams, but you skillfully fashioned together blasphemies, or perhaps you concoct poetry. Come to us with one miracle at the least, just as those earlier <prophets> were sent.* He answered, *We have destroyed, God says, those cities before them who did not believe. Will these believe (21:5,6)?* How indeed will they desire a miracle from him? He used to respond to them, “Since those who went before you did not believe in miracles, neither also do you believe in miracles, nor do you believe except by the sword.”⁵

12.9] Hear therefore, Muḥammadans, if you hold the Qur’ān to be true! It itself is that which affirms that Muḥammad never worked a miracle. But those whom the sword consumed were many more than those who willingly followed him.

¹ I. e., the mosque in Mecca.

² I. e., the author of *Liber denudationis*; this parenthetical note was most likely added here by the translators, who wanted to make clear that after the lengthy quotation of Muḥammad’s account of his night journey, the Mozarabic author has resumed the narrative.

³ I have not found anything quite like this interchange in the Qur’ān or the Ḥadīth.

⁴ I. e., *Sūrat al-Anbiyā’*, the Sūrah (21) of the Prophets.

⁵ For the source of these words see 4.2 above.

Explicit. Benedictus Deus.¹

Interpretem qui uerbum de² uerbo transtulerat³ sum secutus
sensus potius quam verba tenendo et multa breuiando.⁴

¹ Explicit Alpholici libellus benedictus sit Deus *P*²

² de *exp.* *P*²

³ transtulerat] reddiderat

⁴ *add.* Superiora sunt ex Marci Canonici versione plerisque tamen a nobis immutatis ut legentium captui omnia accommodaremus. Arabizantium autem gratia Arabismos puriores reliquimus ut si umquam in septentrionalium manus ms. codex veniret, cum hac uersione conferri posset. *post* breuiando *P*²

It is finished.¹ Praise be to God.

I, by preserving the sense rather than the words, and by abbreviating many things, followed the translator who had translated word for word.²

¹ If Latinists are still not sure what *explicit* means exactly, the *Glossarium*, p. 180, at least, has no doubts, defining it as *kamala* and *tamma*, both meaning "it is completed," "it is finished," etc.

² On this colophon and the problem of who wrote and what exactly it means, see chapter two of my study above, pp. 55-57 ff.

APPENDIX:

A LIST OF PASSAGES OF LIBER DENUDATIONIS QUOTED BY RICCOLDO DA MONTE DI CROCE IN HIS *CONTRA LEGEM SARRACENORUM*

In the following list the successive passages of *Liber denudationis* (LD) that are quoted verbatim or nearly verbatim by Riccoldo are set out by chapter and paragraph number, incipit and explicit, together with the corresponding chapter, page, and line number of the same passage in J.-M. MÉRIGOUX' edition of Riccoldo's *Contra legem sarracenorum* (CLS) in his "L'ouvrage d'un frère prêcheur."

LD 2.1 "Quatuor autem—falsa sunt" and "Tertia pars—seculi dilexerunt": CLS 10, pp. 110-11, ll. 44-57.

LD 2.2 "vos dividemi—et residuum igni deputabitur": CLS 5, p. 81, ll. 42-44.

LD 3.3 "in capitulo *Elmaiede*—*Dei iustitia*": CLS 3, p. 72, ll. 44-48.

LD 4.1 "Iussit mihi—pecuniam suam": CLS 7, p. 88, ll. 41-44.

LD 4.1 "Quicumque dixit—lactrocinatus" and "Venit autem—nasum Ebidorda": CLS 7, pp. 88-89, ll. 51-56.

LD 4.3 "ipsum patrum—doctrinae ipsius": CLS 10, p. 110, ll. 33-44.

LD 5.2 "et ecce—eis responsionem": CLS 6, pp. 85-86, ll. 62-71.

LD 6.1 "Narratur in eorum—[6.4] mendatia palliarent": CLS 13, pp. 119-21, ll. 50-84.

LD 7.2 "Machometus diligebat—*iuramenta vestra*": CLS 8, p. 91, ll. 23-36.

LD 7.4 "O Machomete, Deus—[7.5] dixerunt, 'paenitemus'": CLS 8, p. 91-92, ll. 37-48.

LD 9.4 "Item in capitulo *Elmaiede*—Deus scit omnia": CLS 11, p. 114, ll. 38-45.

LD 9.11 "Item in capitulo *Elkamar*—ex alia parte ciuitatis": CLS 4, p. 78, ll. 53-61.

LD 9.19 “Angariemini—*anathema sit*”: CLS 6, p. 85, ll. 55-56.

LD 10.11 “*subiunxit quoniam*—[10.12] *erat apud Deum*”: CLS 15, pp. 130-31, ll. 163-79.

LD 12.1 “*in capitulo Filiorum Isrrael*—[12.9] *eum secuti sunt*”: CLS 14, pp. 122-24, ll. 5-71.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1] PRIMARY SOURCES IN LATIN

Collections of Latin Texts:

- Gil, I. *Corpus scriptorum Muzarabiorum*, 2 vols., Madrid, 1973.
 Hernández, F. *Los cartularios de Toledo*, Madrid, 1985.
 Langdraf, A. *Écrits théologiques de l'école d'Abélard: Textes inédits*, Louvain, 1934.
 Lottin, O. *Psychologie et morale aux xiie et xiiie siècles* vol. 5: *Problèmes d'histoire littéraire: L'école d'Anselme de Laon et de Guillaume de Champeaux*, Gembloux, Belgium, 1959.

Individual Works:

- Abelard, Peter. *Theologia christiana*, CCCM 12:71-372.
 _____. *Theologia 'scholarium' (recensiones breuiiores)*, CCCM 12:401-80.
 _____. *Theologia 'summi boni'*, CCCM 13:83-201.
 Alphonsi, Petrus. *Dialogi contra Iudaeos*, PL 157:535-72.
 Anonymous. *Liber denudationis siue ostensionis aut patefaciens (alias Contrarietas alfolica)*, ed. and trans. T. Burman, pp. 240-385 above.
 _____. *Fabulae sarracenorum*, Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, lat. 1162, fols. 5-18.
 _____. *Glossarium latino-arabicum ex unico qui exstat codice Leidensi undecimo saeculo in hispania conscripto*, ed. F. Seybold, (*Ergänzungsheft zur Zeitschrift für Assyriologie; Semitistische Studien* 15-17), Berlin, 1900.
 _____. "Vita Mahometi," ed. M. Serrano y Sanz in his "Vida de Mahoma," (see below), pp. 391-95.
 Augustine. *De consensu evangelistarum*, CSEL 43.
 _____. *De doctrina christiana*, CCSL 32:1-167.
 _____. *De Trinitate*, CCSL 50 and 50A.
 _____. *De vera religione*, CCSL 32:187-260.
 Hugh of St. Victor. *De sacramentis christianae fidei*, PL 176:174-618.
 Isidore. *Isidori hispalensis episcopi etymologiarum sive originum libri XX*, 2 vols., ed. W. Lindsay, Oxford, 1911 (there are no page numbers in this edition).
 Lex Mahumet pseudo-prophete que arabice Alchoran, id est, collectio preceptorum vocatur, trans. Robert of Ketton, Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, lat. 1162, fols. 26-140.
 Lull, Ramon. *De convenientia fidei et intellectus in objecto*, ed. I. Salzinger in *Raymundi Lulli Opera omnia* vol. 4, Mainz, 1729, pp. 571-75.
 _____. *De fine in Raimundi Lulli Opera Latina* 9, CCCM 35:232-291.
 _____. *Disputatio Raymundi christiani et Hamar saraceni*, ed. I. Salzinger in *Raymundi Lulli Opera Latina*, vol. 4, Mainz, 1729, pp. 431-77.
 Martí, R. *Explanatio simboli apostolorum ad institutione fidelium a fratre R[aymundo] Martini de Ordine Predicatorum edita*, ed. J. March in his "En Ramón Martí y la seva 'Explanatio simboli apostolorum,'" (see below), pp. 450-96.

- _____. *Quadruplex reprobatio*, Paris, B. N. lat. 4230, fols. 151vb-159rb.
 Recemundo (alias Rabi' ibn Zayd). *Liber anoe*, ed. C. Dozy and C. Pellat in *Le calendrier de Cordoue* (see below) pp. 3-187.
 Riccoldo da Monte di Croce. *Contra legem Sarracenorum*, ed. J.-M. Mérigoux in his "L'ouvrage d'un frère prêcheur florentin," (see below), pp. 60-144.
 _____. *Itinerariu[m] fratris Ricoldi, ordinis Fratrum Predicatorum*, ed. J. Laurent in *Peregrinatores medii aevi quatuor*, Lipzig, 1864, pp. 102-41.
 Richard of St. Victor. *De tribus appropriatis personis in Trinitate*, PL 196:991-94.
 _____. *De Trinitate*, ed. and trans. G. Salet in *Sources chrétiennes* 63 (R. de Saint-Victor, *La trinité*), Paris, 1959.
 Vitalis, Orderic. *Historia ecclesiastica*, ed. and trans. M. Chibnall in *The Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis* 6 vols., Oxford, 1969-80.
 William of St. Thierry. *De erroribus Guillelmi de Conchis*, PL 180:333-40.

2] PRIMARY SOURCES IN ARABIC

Collections of Arabic Sources:

- Graf, G., ed. *Die Schriften des Jacobiten Ḥabīb Ibn Ḥidma Abū Rā'ūa*, CSCO 130, Ss. Arabici 14.
 Luciani, J., ed. *Le livre de Mohammed Ibn Toumert Mahdi des Almohades. Texte arabe accompagné de notices biographiques et d'une introduction par I. Goldziher*, Algiers, 1903.
 Périer, A., ed. *Petits traités apologétiques de Yahyā Ben 'Adī*, Paris, 1920.

Individual Works:

- Abū Dāwūd Sulaymān ibn al-Ash'ath al-Sijistānī. *Sunan Abī Dāwūd*, 5 vols, ed. Muḥammad 'Alī al-Sayyid, Hims, 1969-74.
 Abū Qurrah, Theodore. *Maymār fī wujūd al-khālīq wa-al-dīn al-qawīm*, ed. I. Dick, Beirut, 1986.
 Anonymous. *Fī tathlūth Allāh al-wāḥid*, ed. M. Gibson, *Studia Sinaïtica* 7 (1899):74-107 (English translation, pp. 2-36).
 _____. *Glossarium latino-arabicum* (see under anonymous Latin works).
 _____. *al-Kitāb al-jāmi': wujūh al-imān bi-tathlūth waḥdānīyat Allāh al-kalimah min al-tāḥirah al-'adhrā' Maryam*, excerpts, ed. L. Malouf in "Aqdam al-makhṭūṭāt al-Naṣrānīyah al-'arabīyah," *al-Mashriq* 6 (1903):1014-1023.
 _____. *Risālat 'Abd Allāh ibn Ismā'il al-Hāshimī ilā 'Abd al-Masīh ibn Ishāq al-Kindī yad'ūhu bi-hā ilā al-Islām wa-risālat 'Abd al-Masīh ilā al-Hāshimī yaruddu bi-hā 'alayhi wa-yad'ūhu ilā al-Naṣrānīyah* (*The Apology of El-Kindi: A work of the Ninth Century, Written in Defence of Christianity by an Arab*), London, 1885.
 al-Ash'arī, Abū al-Hasan. *al-Ibānah 'an uṣūl al-dīyānah*, ed. Fawqīyah Ḥusayn Maḥmūd, Cairo, 1977.
 al-Azraqī, Muḥammad ibn 'Abd Allāh ibn Aḥmad. *Akhbār Makkah* ed. by F. Wüstenfeld in *Die Chroniken der Stadt Mekka* 1, Leipzig, 1858.
 al-Bājī, Abū al-Walīd. "Risālat al-rāhib min Ifransah [wa-] jawāb Abī al-Walīd al-Bājī 'alā ḥādhihi al-risālah," ed. by A. Turki in "La lettre du «Moine de France»," (see below), pp. 84-115 (French translation, pp. 116-53).
 al-Baṣrī, 'Ammār. *Kitāb al-masā'il wa-al-ajwibah*, ed. M. Hayek in 'Ammār al-Baṣrī (see below).

- _____. *Kitāb al-burhān*, ed. M. Hayek in 'Ammār al-Baṣṣī (see below).
- al-Bayḍāwī, 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Umar. *Anwār al-tanzīl wa-asrār al-ta'wīl*, ed. H. O. Fleischer in *Beidhawī commentarius in Coranum*, 2 vols. 1846-48, reprint Osnabrück, 1968.
- al-Bukhārī, Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl. *al-Jāmi' al-ṣaḥīḥ*, 4 vols., ed. M. L. Krehl and T. W. Juynboll, Leiden, 1862-1908.
- La cadena árabe del evangelio de San Mateo*, 2 vols., ed. F. Caubet Iturbe, Vatican City, 1969.
- Eutychius Sa'īd ibn al-Baṭrīq (Eutychius of Alexandria). *Kitāb al-burhān*, ed. Pierre Cachia, trans. W. Watt, CSCO 192-93, 209-210.
- al-Ghazzālī, Abū Hāmid. *Ihyā' 'ulūm al-dīn* 5 vols., Cairo, 1968.
- Die griechisch-arabische Evangelien-übersetzung*, Vat. Borg. ar. 95 und Ber. orient. oct. 1108, ed. B. Levin, Uppsala, 1938.
- Ibn Ḥanbal, Aḥmad. *Musnad al-Imām Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal*, 6 vols., Beirut, 1895.
- Ibn Ḥazm, 'Alī ibn Aḥmad. *al-Faṣl fī al-mīlāl wa-al-ahwā' wa-al-niḥāl*, eds. Ibrāhīm Naṣr and 'Abd al-Raḥmān 'Umayrah, 5 vols. Jiddah, 1982.
- Ibn Ishāq, Muḥammad. *Strat rasūl Allāh*, ed. F. Wüstenfeld in *Das Leben Muhammads nach Muhammad ibn Ishāk*, bearbeitet von Abd el-Malik ibn Hishām, 2 vols. Göttingen, 1858-60, reprint, 1961.
- Ibn Jarīr al-Takrīfī, Yahyā. *al-Murshid*, Vatican City, Vat. Borg. Ar. ms. 227.
- Ibn Kathīr al-Dimashqī, Abū al-Fidā'. *Tafsīr al-Qur'ān al-'aẓīm*, 4 vols. ed. Husayn Ibrāhīm Zahrān, Beirut, 1986.
- Ibn Khidmah al-Takrīfī, Ḥabīb. "al-Risālah al-awwalah (sic) fī al-thalūth al-muqaddas," ed. G. Graf in *Die Schriften des Jacobiten Ḥabīb ibn Ḥidma* (see above), pp. 1-26.
- Ibn Rushd, Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad. *Tafsīr mā ba'd al-taḥfāt*, ed. M. Bouyges, *Averroës: Tafsīr mā ba'd al-taḥfāt*, 3 vols., Beirut, 1967-73.
- Ibn Sa'd, Muḥammad. *al-Tabaqāt al-Kubrā*, 8 vols., Beirut, 1377/1957.
- Ibn Ṭufayl, Abū Bakr. *Risālat Ḥayy ibn Yaqẓān fī asrār al-ḥikmah al-mashriqiyah*, ed. and trans. L. Gauthier in *Hayy ben Yaqdhan: Roman philosophique d'Ibn Thofail*, Algiers, 1900.
- Ibn Zayd, Rabī' (alias Recemundo). *Kitāb al-anwā'*, ed. C. Dozy and C. Pellat in *Le calendrier de Cordoue* (see below) pp. 3-187.
- 'Iyād ibn Mūsā ibn 'Iyād al-Yaḥṣubī (Qāḍī 'Iyād), *al-Shifā' bi-ta'rīf ḥuqūq al-muṣṭafā'*, 2 vols., ed. 'Alī Muḥammad al-Bajāwī, Beirut, 1984.
- al-Khaṭṭābī, Shihāb al-Dīn (Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn 'Umar). *Nasīm al-riyād fī sharḥ shifā' al-Qāḍī 'Iyād* 4 vols., Beirut, 1909.
- al-Khazrajī, Aḥmad ibn 'Abd al-Ṣamad. *Maqāmi' al-ṣulbān*, ed. 'Abd al-Majīd al-Sharīf, Tunis, 1975.
- _____. *Maqāmi' al-ṣulbān*, ed. Muḥammad Shāmāh in *Bayna al-Islām wa-al-Masīḥiyyah: Kitāb Abī 'Abidah al-Khazrajī*, Cairo, 1979.
- Maimonides. *Dalālat al-Hā'irīn*, 3 vols., ed. and trans. S. Munk in *Le Guide des Égarés: Traité de Théologie et de Philosophie par Moïse dūt Maïmonide*, Paris, 1856-66.
- Muslim ibn al-Ḥajjāj al-Qushayrī. *al-Ṣaḥīḥ*, no ed., 18 vols. in 9, 1981.
- al-Naṣībī, 'Ilīyā. "al-Majlis al-awwal," ed. Kh. Samir, in "Entretien d'Élie de Nisibe avec le Vizir Ibn 'Alī al-Maḡribī," (see below), pp. 61-117 (French translation, 60-116).
- _____. "al-Majlis al-thālith," ed. L. Cheikho, *al-Mashriq* 20 (1922):118-22.
- _____. "al-Majlis al-sādis," ed. L. Cheikho, *al-Mashriq* 20 (1922):366-77.
- al-Qurtubī, al-Imām. *al-Fīlām bi-mā fī dīn al-naṣārā min al-fasād wa-awḥām wa-izhār maḥāsīn dīn al-islām wa-ithbāt nubūwat nabīnā Muḥammad 'alayhi al-ṣalāh wa-al-salām*, ed. Aḥmad Hijāzī al-Saqqā, Cairo, 1980.

- _____. *al-Flām bi-mā fi dīn al-naṣārā min al-fasād wa-awḥām wa-izhār maḥāsīn dīn al-islām wa-iḥbāt nubūwat nabīnā Muḥammad ‘alayhi al-ṣalāh wa-al-salām*, edition of first part, by P. Devillard in "Thèse sur al-Qurṭubī (édition)" (see below).
- al-Qurṭubī, Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Anṣārī. *al-Jāmi‘ li-aḥkām al-Qur’ān*, 20 vols. (each edited separately by a different scholar), Beirut, 1985.
- al-Subkī, Tāj al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Wahhāb. *Ṭabaqāt al-shāfi‘īyah al-kubrā* 10 vols., ed. Maḥmūd Muḥammad al-Tanāḥī and ‘Abd al-Fattāḥ Muḥammad al-Ḥulū, Cairo, 1964.
- al-Ṭabarānī, Ibrāhīm. *Majālis Ibrāhīm al-Ṭabarānī*, ed. and trans. G. Marcuzzo in *Le dialogue d’Abraham de Tibériade* (see below), pp. 251-533.
- al-Ṭabarī, ‘Alī. *al-Radd ‘alā al-Naṣārā*, eds. I.-A. Khalifé and W. Kutsch in "Ar-radd ‘alā-n-Naṣārā de ‘Alī aṭ-Ṭabarī," *Mélanges de l’Université Saint Joseph* 36 (1959):115-48.
- al-Ṭabarī, Muḥammad ibn Jarīr. *Jāmi‘ al-bayān ‘an ta’wīl āy al-Qur’ān*, 30 vols. in 12, ed. Muḥammad Maḥmūd al-Ḥalabī, Cairo, 1968.
- _____. *Ta’rīkh al-rusul wa-al-mulūk* 13 vols. in 3 series, ed. M. J. de Goeje et al., Leiden, 1879-1901.
- Tatian. *al-Diyātasarūn. Diatessaron de Tatien* (Arabic trans.) ed. A.-S. Marmardji, Beirut, 1935.
- Ṭīmāthāwus al-Jāthliq. *al-Muḥāwarah al-dīniyah allatī jarat bayna al-khalīfah al-Mahdī wa-Ṭīmāthāwus al-Jāthliq* [earliest recension], ed. R. Caspar in "Les versions arabes du dialogue entre le Catholicos Timothée I et le Calife al-Mahdī," (see below), pp. 125-52 (French translation, pp. 153-75).
- _____. *al-Muḥāwarah al-dīniyah allatī jarat bayna al-khalīfah al-Mahdī wa-Ṭīmāthāwus al-Jāthliq* [latest recension], ed. L. Cheikho, *al-Mashriq* 19 (1921) 359-74, 408-19.
- al-Tirmidhī, Muḥammad ibn ‘Isā. *Sunan al-Tirmidhī*, 10 vols, Hims, 1969.
- al-Ṭūsī, Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan. *al-Tibyān fi tafsīr al-Qur’ān*, 10 vols, Najaf, 1376/1957-1383/1963.
- Ūrūsīus, *Ta’rīkh al-‘ālam* (Arabic trans. of Orosius' *Historiae contra paganos*) ed. by ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Badawī, Beirut, 1982.
- al-Zamakhsharī, Maḥmūd ibn ‘Umar. *al-Kashshāf ‘an ḥaqā’iq ghawāmiḍ al-tanzīl wa-uyūn al-aqāwīl fi wujūh al-ta’wīl* 4 vols., Beirut 1366/1947.

3) SECONDARY LITERATURE

- Abel, A. "L'Apologie d'Al-Kindī et sa place dans la polémique Islamo-chrétienne," *L'Oriente cristiana nella storia della civiltà*, Rome, 1964, pp. 501-23.
- Abulafia, D. "The End of Muslim Sicily," in J. Powell, *Muslims under Latin Rule* (see below), pp. 103-33.
- Allard, M. *Le problème des attributs divins dans la doctrine d'Al-Aṣṣārī et de ses premiers grands disciples*, Beirut, 1965.
- d'Alverny, M.-Th. "La connaissance de l'Islam en Occident du ix^e au milieu du xii^e siècle," in *L'occidente e l'Islam nell'alto medioevo* vol. 2 (*Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo* 12) Spoleto, 1965, pp. 577-602.
- _____. "Deux traductions latines du Coran au Moyen Age," *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Age* 22-23 (1947-48), pp. 69-131.
- _____. "Marc de Tolède," in *Estudios sobre Alfonso VI y la reconquista de Toledo*, vol. 3 (see below), pp. 25-59

- _____. "Quelques manuscrits de la «Collectio Toletana»,” in G. Constable and J. Kritzeck, eds., *Petrus Venerabilis, 1156-1956: Studies and Texts Commemorating the Eighth Centenary of his Death* (Studia Anselmiana 40), Rome, 1956, pp. 202-18.
- d'Alverny, M.-Th., and G. Vajda, "Marc de Tolède, traducteur d'Ibn Tūmart,” *al-Andalus* 16 (1951) pp. 99-140 & 259-307, and 17 (1952) pp. 1-56.
- Anawati, G. "Polémique, apologie et dialogue Islamo-chrétiens. Positions classiques médiévales et positions contemporaines,” *Euntes docete* 22 (1969):375-451.
- Ashtor, E. *The Jews of Moslem Spain*, 2 vols., trans. A. Klein and J. Macholowitz Klein, Philadelphia, 1973-79.
- Asín-Palacios, M. *Abenházam de Córdoba, y su historia crítica de las ideas religiosas*, 5 vols., Madrid, 1927-32.
- _____. *Abenmasarra y su escuela: Orígenes de la filosofía hispano-musulmana* (apéndice 6: *La teoría de las «hadrās» de Ibn 'Arabī y las «dignitates» de Lulio*) in *Obras escogidas* 1 (Madrid, 1946), pp. 204-16.
- Baer, Y. *A History of the Jews in Christian Spain*, 2 vols., trans., L. Schoffman, Philadelphia, 1978.
- Barceló Torres, C. *Minorías islámicas en el país valenciano: historia y dialecto*, Valencia, 1984.
- Berthier, A. "Un Maître orientaliste du XIIIe siècle: Raymond Martin O.P.” *Archivum fratrum praedicatorum* 6 (1936):267-311.
- Bischoff, B. et al. *Nomenclature des écritures livresques du IXe au XVe siècle*, Paris, 1954.
- Blumenkranz, B. *Juifs et chrétiens dans le monde occidental, 430-1096*, Paris, 1960.
- _____. "Augustin et les Juifs, Augustin et le judaïsme,” in *Recherches augustiniennes* 1 (1958): 225-41.
- Bonner, A. *Selected Works of Ramon Llull*, 2 vols., Princeton, 1985.
- Bouamama, A. *La littérature polémique musulmane contre le christianisme depuis ses origines jusqu'au XIIIe siècle*, Algiers, 1988.
- Brock, S. "Aspects of Translation Technique in Antiquity,” *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 20 (1979):69-87.
- Brockelmann, C. *Geschichte der arabischen Litteratur*, 2nd ed., 2 vols. and 3 supplementary vols, Leiden, 1937-48.
- Bulliet, R. *Conversion to Islam in the Medieval Period: An Essay in Quantitative History*, Cambridge, 1979.
- Burman, T. "Christian *Kalām* in Medieval Spain,” in *Spain and the Mediterranean in the Middle Ages: Essays in Honor of Robert I. Burns, S. J.*, ed. L. Simon, forthcoming from E. J. Brill, Leiden.
- _____. "The Influence of the *Apology of al-Kindī* and *Contrarietas alfolica* on Ramon Lull's Late Religious Polemics,” *Mediaeval Studies* 53 (1991): 197-228.
- _____. "Spain's Arab Christians and Islam, c. 1050-1200: The Text of *Liber denudationis* (alias *Contrarietas alfolica*) and its Intellectual Milieu,” Ph. D. dissertation, University of Toronto, 1991.
- _____. "'Tathlīth al-wahdānīyah' and the Andalusī-Christian Approach to Islam,” in *Medieval Christian Perceptions of Islam*, ed. J. Tolan, forthcoming from Garland Press, New York.
- Burnett, C. "The Translating Activity in Medieval Spain,” in S. Jayyusi, ed., *The Legacy of Muslim Spain* (see below), pp. 1036-58.

- Burns, R. "Muslims in the Thirteenth-Century Realms of Aragon: Interaction and Reaction," in J. Powell, ed., *Muslims under Latin Rule, 1100-1300* (see below), pp. 57-102.
- Buytaert, E. "Abelard's Trinitarian Doctrine," in *Peter Abelard: Proceedings of the International Conference, Louvain, May 10-12, 1971*, ed. E. Buytaert, Leuven, 1974, pp. 127-52.
- Cantarino, V. *Entre monjes y musulmanes: el conflicto que fue España*, Madrid, 1978.
- Cardaillac, L., ed. *Tolède, XIIe-XIIIe. Musulmans, chrétiens et juifs: le savoir et la tolérance*, Paris, 1991.
- Casciaro Ramirez, J. M. "Las glosas marginales árabes del codex visigothicus legionensis de la vulgata," *Scripta theologica* 2 (1970):303-39.
- Caspar, R. "Les versions arabes du dialogue entre le Catholicos Timothée I et le Calife al-Mahdi (IIe/VIIe siècle) «Mohammed a suivi la voie des prophètes»," *Islamochristiana* 3 (1977):107-75.
- _____. "Textes de la tradition musulmane concernant le *tahrif* (falsification) des écritures," *Islamochristiana* 6 (1981):61-104.
- _____. *Traité de théologie musulmane* vol. I: *Histoire de la pensée religieuse musulmane*, Rome, 1987.
- Caspar, R., et al., *Bibliographie du dialogue islamo-chrétien*, published successively in *Islamochristiana* beginning with volume 1 (1975).
- Cerulli, E. *Il "Libro della scala" e la questione delle fonti arabo-spagnole della Divina Commedia*, Vatican, 1949.
- Châtillon, J. "Unitas, aequalitas, concordia vel connexio. Recherches sur les origines de la théorie thomiste des appropriations (*Sum. theol.*, I, q. 39, art. 7-8)," in *St. Thomas Aquinas, 1274-1974: Commemorative Studies* 1, no. ed., Toronto, 1974.
- Chazan, R. *Daggers of Faith: Thirteenth-Century Christian Missionizing and Jewish Response*, Berkeley, 1989.
- Cheikho, L. *Shu'arā' al-Naṣrānīyah qabla al-islām*, Beirut, 1890.
- Chittick, W. *The Sufi Path of Knowledge*, Albany, 1989.
- Cohen, J. *The Friars and the Jews: the Evolution of Medieval Anti-Judaism*, Ithaca & London, 1982.
- Colbert, E. *The Martyrs of Córdoba (850-59): a Study of the Sources*, Washington, 1962.
- Collins, R. *Early Medieval Spain: Unity in Diversity, 400-1000*, New York, 1983.
- Colomer Pou, E. "Ramon Llull y Ramon Martí," *Estudios Lulianos* 28 (1988):1-37.
- Cortabarría Beitia, A. "La connaissance des textes arabes chez Raymond Martin O. P. et sa position en face de l'Islam," in *Islam et chrétiens du Midi (XIIe-XIVe s.) (Cahiers de Fanjeaux 18)*, Toulouse, 1983, pp. 279-300.
- _____. "Les études mozarabes en Espagne," *Mélanges de l'Institut Dominicain d'Études Orientales du Caire* 14 (1980):5-74.
- _____. "Fuentes árabes del «Pugio fidei» de Ramón Martí: Algazel (1085 [sic]-1111)," *Ciencia tomista* 112 (1985):581-96.
- Cruz-Hernández, M. *Historia de la filosofía hispano-musulmana*, 2 vols., Madrid, 1957.
- _____. *El pensamiento de Ramon Llull*, Valencia, 1977.
- Cutler, A. *The Jew as Ally of the Muslim: Medieval Roots of Anti-Semitism*, Notre Dame, 1986.

- Daiber, H. "Orosius' *Historiae adversus paganos* in arabischer Überlieferung," in J. van Heuten et al., eds., *Tradition and Reinterpretation in Jewish and Early Christian Literature: Essays in Honor of Jürgen C. H. Lebram*, Leiden, 202-49.
- Dall'Arche, M. *Scomparsa del Cristianesimo ed espansione dell'Islam nell'Africa settentrionale*, Rome, 1967.
- Daniel, N. *Islam and the West: the Making of an Image*, Edinburgh, 1960.
- _____. *The Arabs and Mediaeval Europe*, 2nd ed., London, 1979.
- de la Granja, F. "Milagros españoles en una obra musulmana (El "Kitāb Maqāmi' al-Sulbān" del Jazrāyī)," *al-Andalus* 33 (1968): 311-65.
- de las Cagigas, I. *Minorías étnico-religiosas de la Edad Media española I: Los mozárabes* 2 vols., Madrid, 1947-48.
- Delgado, H. "Le «De Seta Machometi» du Cod. 46 d'Osma, oeuvre de Raymond Martin (Ramón Martí)," in *Islam et chrétiens du Midi (XIIe-XIVe s.)* (*Cahiers de Fanjeaux* 18), Toulouse, 1983, pp. 351-71.
- Devillard, P. "Thèse sur al-Qurtubī," Thèse de troisième cycle présentée à la Faculté des Lettres à Aix-en-Provence (in three unnumbered volumes, one containing an introduction, another an edition of the first part of al-Qurtubī's *al-Flām*, and another containing a French translation of the edited text), 1969.
- Díaz y Díaz, M. "Agustín entre los mozárabes: un testimonio," *Agustinus* 25 (1980): 157-80.
- _____. "Breves notas sobre los mozárabes de Toledo," *Estudios sobre Alfonso VI y la reconquista de Toledo* (see below) vol. 3, pp. 11-24.
- _____. "La circulation des manuscrits dans la Péninsule Ibérique du VIIe au XIe siècles," *Cahiers de Civilisation Médiévale* 12 (1969): 219-241, 383-92.
- _____. *Libros y librerías en la Rioja altomedieval*, Logroño, 1979.
- _____. "Textos altomedievales extrahispanos en la península," in *Coloquio sobre circulación de códices y escritos entre Europa y la península en los siglos VIII-XIII, 16-19 Septiembre, 1982: Actas*, Santiago de Compostela, 1988, pp. 239-65.
- _____. "La transmisión de los textos antiguos en la Península Ibérica en los siglos VII-XI," in *La cultura antica nell'Occidente latino dal vii all'xi secolo, 18-24 aprile 1974*, vol.1 (*Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo* 22), pp. 133-75.
- _____. "La vida literaria entre los mozárabes de Toledo (siglos VII-XI)," in *Arte y cultura mozárabe (Ponencias y comunicaciones presentadas al I Congreso Internacional de Estudios Mozárabes: Toledo, 1975)*, Toledo, 1979, pp. 71-100.
- Divjak, J. "La présence de saint Augustin en Espagne," in *Coloquio sobre la circulación de códices y escritos entre Europa y la península en los siglos VIII-XIII, 16-19 Septiembre, 1982: Actas*, Santiago de Compostela, 1988, pp. 9-34.
- Dozy, R. *Supplément aux dictionnaires arabes*, 2 vols. Leiden, 1881, rpt. 1960.
- Dozy, R. and C. Pellat, eds., *Le calendrier de Cordoue*, Leiden, 1961.
- Dronke, P., ed. *A History of Twelfth-Century Western Philosophy*, Cambridge, 1988.
- Dufourcq, C.-E. "Le christianisme dans les pays de l'Occident musulman, des alentours de l'an mil jusqu'aux temps almohades," in *Études de civilisation médiévale (IXe-XIIe siècles)*, *Mélanges offerts à Edmond-René Labande*, Poitiers n. d. (1974?), 237-46.

- _____. "Les Mozarabes du XIIe siècle et le prétendu 'Évêque' de Lisbonne," *Revue d'histoire et de civilisation du Maghreb* 5 (1968):125-30.
- Dunlop, D. "A Christian Mission to Muslim Spain in the XIth Century," *al-Andalus* 17 (1952):259-310.
- _____. "Ḥaṣṣ b. Albar—the Last of the Goths?" *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1954, 136-51.
- _____. "Sobre Ḥaṣṣ ibn Albar Al-Qūṭī al-Qurṭubī," *al-Andalus* 20 (1955):211-13.
- Du Roy, O. *L'Intelligence de la foi en la Trinité selon Saint Augustin: Genèse de sa théologie trinitaire jusqu'en 391*, Paris, 1966.
- Eijo Garay, L. "Las dignidades lulianas," *Estudios Lulianos* 18 (1974):26-46.
- Epalza, M. de. "Los cristianos en las Baleares musulmanas," in *Les illes orientales d'al-Andalus i les seves relacions amb sharq al-Andalus, Magrib i Europa cristiana* (ss. vii-xiii), ed. G. Rosselló-Bordoy, Palma de Mallorca, 1987, pp. 133-43.
- _____. "La islamización de al-Andalus: mozárabes y neo-mozárabes," *Revista del Instituto Egipcio de Estudios Islámicos en Madrid* 23 (1985-86):171-79.
- _____. "Mozarabs: An Emblematic Christian Minority in Islamic Al-Andalus," in S. Jayyusi, *The Legacy of Muslim Spain* (see below), pp. 149-75.
- _____. "Notes pour une histoire des polémiques anti-chrétiennes dans l'occident musulman," *Arabica* 18 (1971), pp. 99-106.
- _____. "Trois siècles d'histoire Mozarabe," *Travaux et jours* 22 (1965):25-40.
- _____. *La Tuhfa, autobiografía y polémica islámica contra el Cristianismo de 'Abdallāh al-Taryūmān (fray Anselmo Turneda)*, Rome, 1971.
- Epalza, M. de and E. Llobregat. "¿Hubo mozárabes en tierras valencianas? Proceso de islamización del Levante de la Península (Sharq al-Andalus)," *Revista de investigación y ensayos del Instituto de Estudios Alicantinos* 36 (1982):7-31.
- Epalza, M. de and M. J. Rubiera. "Los cristianos toledanos bajo dominación musulmana," in *Simpósio Toledo hispanoárabe* (see below) pp. 129-33.
- Estudios sobre Alfonso VI y la reconquista de Toledo. Actas del II Congreso Internacional de Estudios Mozárabes (Toledo, 20-26 Mayo 1985)*, 3 vols., Toledo, 1986-92.
- Evans, G. "St. Anselm's Images of the Trinity," *Journal of Theological Studies*, New Series, 27 (1976):46-57.
- Fackenheim, E. "'Substance' and 'Perseity' in Medieval Arabic Philosophy with Introductory Chapters on Aristotle, Plotinus, and Proclus," Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Toronto, 1945.
- Fletcher, M. "al-Andalus and North Africa in the Almohad Ideology," in S. Jayyusi, ed., *The Legacy of Muslim Spain* (see below), pp. 235-58.
- _____. "The Almohad Tawḥīd: Theology which Relies on Logic," *Numen* 38 (1991):110-27.
- Franke, F. R. "Die freiwilligen Märtyrer von Cordova und das Verhältnis der Mozaraber zum Islam (nach den Schriften des Sperandio, Eulogius und Alvar)," *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kulturgeschichte Spaniens* 13 (1958):1-170.
- Fritsch, E. *Islam und Christentum im Mittelalter. Beiträge zur Geschichte der muslimischen Polemik gegen das Christentum in arabischer Sprache*, Breslau, 1930.

- Galmés de Fuentes, A. "La lengua de los mozárabes de Toledo: Un diálogo en la calle," in *Simpósio Toledo hispanoárabe* (see below), pp. 135-51.
- Gardet, L. *Dieu et la destinée de l'homme*, Paris, 1967.
- _____. *L'Islam, religion et communauté*, Paris, 1967.
- Gardet, L. and G. Anawati. *Introduction à la théologie musulmane. Essai de théologie comparée*, Paris, 1948.
- Gervers, M. and R. Bikhazi, eds. *Conversion and Continuity: Indigenous Christian Communities in Islamic Lands, Eighth to Eighteenth Centuries*, Toronto, 1990.
- Ghellinck, J. de. *Le mouvement théologique du XII^e siècle*, 2nd ed., Bruges, 1948.
- Gimaret, D. *Les noms divins en Islam: exégèse lexicographique et théologique*, Paris, 1988.
- _____. *La doctrine d'al-Ash'arī*, Paris, 1990.
- Glick, T. *Islamic and Christian Spain in the Early Middle Ages: Comparative Perspectives on Social and Cultural Formation*, Princeton, 1979.
- Goldziher, I. *The Zāhīrīs: Their Doctrine and their History, a Contribution to the History of Islamic Civilization*, trans. W. Behn, Leiden, 1971.
- González, J. *Repoblación de Castilla la Nueva*, 2 vols., Madrid, 1975.
- _____. "Los mozárabes toledanos desde el siglo XI hasta el Cardenal Cisneros," in *Historia mozárabe* (see below), pp. 79-90.
- González-Palencia, A. *Los mozárabes de Toledo en los siglos XII y XIII*, 3 vols. and a *Volumen preliminar*, Madrid, 1926-30.
- González, R. "El arcediano Joffre de Loaysa y las parroquias urbanas de Toledo en 1300," in *Historia mozárabe* (see below), pp. 91-148.
- _____. "Noticias sobre códices mozárabes en los antiguos inventarios de la biblioteca capitular de Toledo," in *Historia mozárabe* (see below), pp. 45-78.
- _____. "The Persistence of the Mozarabic Liturgy in Toledo after A. D. 1080," in B. Reilly, ed., *Santiago, Saint-Denis, and Saint Peter* (see below), pp. 167-85.
- _____. "La sociedad toledana bajomedieval (siglos XII-XIV)," in no ed. *I Congreso Internacional "Encuentros de las Tres Culturas"* (3-7 Octubre, 1982), Toledo, 1983, pp. 141-55.
- Goussen H. *Die christlich-arabische Literatur der Mozaraber (Beiträge zur christlich-arabischen Literaturgeschichte 4)*, Leipzig, 1909.
- Goy, R. *Die Überlieferung der Werke Hugos von St. Viktor (Monographien zur Geschichte des Mittelalters 14)*, Stuttgart, 1976.
- Graf, G. "Christliche Polemik gegen den Islam," *Gelbe Hefte* 1926/II, 825-42.
- _____. *Geschichte der christlichen arabischen Literatur*, 5 vols., Vatican City, 1944-53.
- _____. *Verzeichnis arabischer kirchlicher Termini* (CSCO 147, Subsidia 8), Louvain, 1954.
- Griffith, S. "'Ammār al-Baṣrī's *Kitāb al-burhān*: Christian *Kalām* in the First Abbasid Century," *Le Musaeon* 98 (1983):145-81.
- _____. "The First *Summa Theologiae* in Arabic: Christian *Kalām* in Ninth-Century Palestine," in Gervers and Bikhazi, eds., *Conversion and Continuity* (see above), pp. 15-31.
- _____. "Habīb ibn Hīdima Abū Rā'īṭah, A Christian *Mutakallim* of the First Abbasid Century," *Oriens Christianus* 64 (1980):161-201.
- Guichard, P. "Les Mozarabes de Valence et d'al-Andalus entre l'histoire et le mythe," *Revue de l'Occident musulman et de la Méditerranée* 40 (1985):17-27.

- _____. "The Social History of Muslim Spain from the Conquest to the End of the Almohad Régime (Early 2nd/8th-Early 7th/13th Centuries)," in S. Jayyusi, ed., *The Legacy of Muslim Spain* (see below), pp. 679-708.
- Guillaume, A. *The Traditions of Islam. An Introduction to the Study of the Hadith Literature*, Oxford, 1924, rpt. Beirut, 1966.
- Haddad, R. *La Trinité divine chez les théologiens arabes (750-1050)*, Paris, 1985.
- Haskins, C. H. *The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century*, Cambridge, MA, 1927.
- Hayek, M. *'Ammār al-Basrī, apologie et controverses*, Beyrouth, 1977.
- Hernández, F. *Los cartularios de Toledo*, Madrid, 1985.
- _____. "Language and Cultural Identity: The Mozarabs of Toledo," *Boletín Burriel* 1 (1989):29-48.
- _____. "La cathédrale, instrument d'assimilation," in L. Cardaillac, ed., *Toledo, Xlle-Xllle* (see above), pp. 75-91.
- Historia mozárabe (Ponencias y comunicaciones presentadas al I Congreso Internacional de Estudios Mozárabes, Toledo, 1975)*, no ed., Toledo, 1978.
- Hitchcock, R. "¿Quiénes fueron los verdaderos mozárabes? Una contribución a la historia de mozarabismo," *Nueva Revista de Filología hispánica* 30 (1981):574-85.
- Hitti, P. *History of the Arabs*, 10th ed., New York, 1970.
- Hofmeier, J. *Die Trinitätslehre des Hugo von St. Viktor*, Munich, 1963.
- Husik, I. *A History of Mediaeval Jewish Philosophy*, New York, 1916, 1940.
- Idris, H. "Les tributaires en occident musulman médiéval d'après le 'Mi'fār' d'al-Wahšārīšī," *Mélanges d'Islamologie. Volume dédié à la mémoire de Armand Abel par ses collègues, ses élèves et ses amis*, ed. P. Salmon, Leiden, 1974, pp. 172-96.
- Jayyusi, S., ed. *The Legacy of Muslim Spain*, Leiden, 1992.
- Jeauneau, E. "Note sur l'école de Chartres," *Studi medievali*, 3rd Series, 5 (1964):821-65.
- Johnston, M. *The Spiritual Logic of Ramon Llull*, Oxford, 1987.
- Kassis, H. "Muslim Revival in Spain in the Fifth/Eleventh Century: Causes and Ramifications," *Der Islam* (67) 1990:78-110.
- Kedar, B. *Crusade and Mission: European Approaches toward the Muslims*, Princeton, 1984.
- Khoury, A. *Polémique byzantine contre l'Islam (viie-xiiie siècles)*, Leiden, 1972.
- Khoury, P. *Matériaux pour servir à l'étude de la controverse théologique islamo-chrétienne de langue arabe du VIIIe au XIIe siècle*, vol. 1 (*Religionswissenschaftliche Studien II/1*), Würzburg, 1989.
- _____. *Paul d'Antioche, évêque melkite de Sidon (Xlle siècle)*, Beirut, 1964.
- Knysh, A. "'Orthodoxy' and 'Heresy' in Medieval Islam: An Essay in Reassessment," *The Muslim World* 83 (1993):48-67.
- Kritzeck, J. *Peter the Venerable and Islam*, Princeton, 1964.
- Lagardère, V. "Communautés mozarabes et pouvoir almoravide en 519 H / 1125 en Andalus," *Studia Islamica* 67 (1988):99-119.
- Lane, E. *An Arabic-English Lexicon*, 8 vols., London and Edinburgh, 1863-1893.
- Lasker, D. *Jewish Philosophical Polemics against Christianity in the Middle Ages*, New York, 1977.

- Latham, J. "Arabic into Medieval Latin," *Journal of Semitic Studies* 17 (1972):30-67.
- . "Arabic into Medieval Latin (2)," *Journal of Semitic Studies* 21 (1977):120-37.
- Lecker, M. "The Bewitching of the Prophet Muḥammad by the Jews: A Note *a propos* 'Abd al-Malik b. Ḥabīb's *Mukhtaṣar fī al-ṭibb*," *al-Qanṭara* 13 (1992):561-69.
- Lemay, R. "Dans l'Espagne du XIIe siècle: Les traductions de l'Arabe au Latin," *Annales: Économies, Sociétés, Civilisations* 18 (1963):639-65.
- León Tello, P. "La judería, un air de réussite," in L. Cardaillac, ed., *Tolède, XIIe-XIIIe* (see above).
- . *Judios de Toledo*, 2 vols., Madrid, 1979.
- Levi della Vida, G. "I Mozarabi tra occidente e Islam," in *L'occidente e l'Islam nell'alto medioevo* vol. 2 (*Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'Alto Medioevo* 12), Spoleto, 1965, pp. 667-695.
- . "Un texte mozarabe d'histoire universelle," *Études d'orientalisme dédiées à la mémoire de Lévi-Provençal* 1, Paris, 1962, pp. 175-83.
- Lévi-Provençal, E. *Inscriptions arabes d'Espagne*, Leiden & Paris, 1931.
- Lewis, B. *The Muslim Discovery of Europe*, New York, 1982.
- Lewis, C. S. *The Discarded Image: An Introduction to Medieval and Renaissance Literature*, Cambridge, 1964.
- "Linajes mozarabes de Toledo en los siglos XII y XIII," (no author listed) in *Genealogías mozarabes: Ponencias y comunicaciones presentadas al Congreso Internacional de Estudios Mozárabes, Toledo, 1975* (Toledo, 1981), pp. 23-27.
- Lindberg, D. "The Transmission of Greek and Arabic Learning to the West," in D. Lindberg, ed. *Science in the Middle Ages*, Chicago, 1978, pp. 52-90.
- Little, L. *Religious Poverty and the Profit Economy in Medieval Europe*, Cornell, 1978.
- Lohr, Ch. "Ramon Llull, Liber Alquindi and Liber Telif," *Estudios Lulianos* 12 (1968), pp. 145-60.
- . "Christianus arabicus, cuius nomen Raimundus Lullus," *Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie* series 4, 31 (1984), pp. 57-88.
- Losa, A. "Moçárabes em território português nos séculos X e XI: Contribuição para o estudo da antroponímia no *Liber testamentorum* de Lorvão," in *Islão e arabismo na península ibérica. Actas do XI congresso da União Europeia de Arabistas e Islamólogos* (Évora - Faro - Silves, 29 Set. - 6 Out. 1982), Évora, 1986, pp. 273-89.
- Luscombe, D. *The School of Peter Abelard: the Influence of Abelard's Thought in the Early Scholastic Period*, Cambridge, 1969.
- March, J. "En Ramón Martí y la seva 'Explanatio symboli apostolorum,'" *Anuari de l'Institut d'Estudis Catalans* (1908):443-496.
- Marcuzzo, G. *Le dialogue d'Abraham de Tibériade avec 'Abd al-Rahmān al-Haṣimī à Jérusalem vers 820: étude, édition critique et traduction annotée de la littérature arabe*, Rome, 1986.
- Mérigoux, J.-M. "L'ouvrage d'un frère prêcheur florentin en Orient à la fin du XIIIe siècle. Le «Contra legem Sarracenorum» de Riccoldo da Monte di Croce," in *Fede e controversia nel '300 e '500 (Memorie Domenicane, nuova serie, 14)*, Pistoia, 1986, pp. 1-144.
- Merle, H. "'Dignitas': signification philosophique et théologique de ce terme chez Lulle et ses prédécesseurs médiévaux," *Estudios Lulianos* 21 (1977):173-93.

- Mews, D. "The Development of the Theologia of Peter Abelard," in *Petrus Abaelardus (1079-1142): Person, Werk und Wirkung*, ed. R. Thomas, Trier, 1980, pp. 183-98.
- Millás-Valicrosa, J. "Algunas relaciones entre la doctrina luliana y la Cabala," *Sefarad* 18 (1958):241-53.
- Millet-Gérard, D. *Chrétiens mozarabes et culture islamique dans l'Espagne des viii^e-ix^e siècles*, Paris, 1984.
- Molénat, J.-P. "Des Beni 'Abd al-Malik aux comtes d'Orgas: Le lignage de Gonzalo Ruiz de Toledo," in *Estudios sobre Alfonso VI y la reconquista de Toledo 2* (see above), pp. 259-79.
- _____. "Les Mozarabes: un exemple d'intégration," in L. Cardaillac, *Tolède, XIIe-XIIIe* (see above), pp. 95-101.
- _____. "Quartiers et communautés à Tolède (XIIe-XVe siècles)," *En la España Medieval* 12 (1989):163-89.
- Monneret de Villard, Ugo. *Lo studio dell'Islam in Europa nel XII e nel XIII secolo*, Vatican City, 1944.
- Monnet, G. "Les citations coraniques dans le "Dialogus" de Pierre Alphonse," in *Islam et Chrétiens du Midi (XIIe-XIVe s.)* (*Cahiers de Fanjeaux* 18), Toulouse, 1983, pp. 261-77.
- Morris, C. *The Papal Monarchy: The Western Church from 1050-1250*, Oxford, 1989.
- Morewedge, P. *The Metaphisica of Avicenna*, New York, 1973.
- O'Callaghan, J. "The Mudejars of Castile and Portugal in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries," in J. Powell, ed. *Muslims under Latin Rule* (see below), pp. 11-56.
- Paret, R. *Der Koran: Kommentar und Konkordanz*, Stuttgart, 1971.
- Parrinder, G. *Jesus in the Qur'ān*, London & New York, 1965.
- Pastor de Togneri, R. *Del Islam al Cristianismo. En las fronteras de las formaciones económico-sociales: Toledo, siglos XI-XIII*, Barcelona, 1975.
- _____. "Problèmes d'assimilation d'une minorité. Les Mozarabes de Tolède de 1085 à la fin du XIII^e siècle," *Annales: Économies, Sociétés, Civilisations* 25 (1970):351-90.
- Pérez Fernández-Figares, J. "Los mozárabes en el norte de España," *Cuadernos de estudios medievales* 12-13 (1984-85):155-76.
- Picard, C. "Les Mozarabes dans l'Occident ibérique (VIIIe-XIIe siècles)," *Revue des Études Islamiques* 51 (1983):77-88.
- Pounds, N. *An Economic History of Medieval Europe*, London, 1974.
- Powell, J., ed. *Muslims under Latin Rule, 1100-1300*, Princeton, 1990.
- Prawer, J. *The Crusaders' Kingdom: European Colonialism in the Middle Ages*, New York, 1972.
- Pring-Mill, R. *El microcosmos lul·lià*, Palma, 1961.
- Reilly, B. *The Contest of Christian and Muslim Spain, 1031-1157*, Oxford, 1992.
- _____, ed. *Santiago, Saint-Denis, and Saint Peter: The Reception of the Roman Liturgy in León-Castile in 1080*, New York, 1985.
- Reinhardt, K. "Bibel und Kultur in Toledo zur Zeit der reconquista. Beobachtungen aufgrund des Handschriftenbestandes der Kapitelsbibliothek von Toledo," in H.-W. Stork, et. al, eds., *Ars et ecclesia. Festschrift für Franz J. Ronig zum 60. Geburtstag*, Trier, 1989.

- _____. "Biblia y cultura en la época de la reconquista: De la patristica a la escolástica," in *Estudios sobre Alfonso VI y la reconquista de Toledo* 3 (see above), pp. 131-52.
- Riu, M. "Marmuyas, sede de una población mozárabe en los montes de Málaga," *Mainake: estudios de arqueología malaguera* 2-3 (1980-81):235-262.
- _____. "Poblados mozárabes de al-Andalus. Hipótesis para su estudio: El ejemplo de Busquístar," *Cuadernos de estudios medievales* 2-3 (1974-75):3-35.
- Robinson, N. *Christ in Islam and Christianity*, Albany, 1991.
- Rubeira Mata, M. "Les premiers Mores convertis ou les prémices de la tolérance," in L. Cardaillac, *Tolède, Xlle-Xllle* (see above), pp. 102-11.
- al-Šaddādī, 'Abd al-Jāliq. Review of L. Cardaillac, *Tolède Xlle-Xllle* (see above) in *al-Qanṭara* 13 (1992):614-18.
- Samir, Kh. "Entretien d'Élie de Nisibe avec le vizir Ibn 'Alī al-Mağribī, sur l'unité et la Trinité," *Islamochristiana* 5 (1980):31-117.
- _____. Review of A. Charfi's edition of *Maqāmī' al-ṣulbān* in *Islamochristiana* 6 (1981):242-54.
- _____. "al-Turāth al-ʿarabī al-masiḥī al-qadīm wa-tafāʿuluḥu maʿa al-fikr al-ʿarabī al-islāmī," *Islamochristiana* 8 (1983):1-33 Arabic.
- Schwinges, R. *Kreuzzugsideologie und Toleranz: Studien zu Wilhelm von Tyrus* (*Monographien zur Geschichte des Mittelalters* 15), Stuttgart, 1977.
- Serrano y Sanz, M. "Vida de Mahoma, según un código latino de mediados del siglo XIII," *Erudición ibero-ultramarina* 2 (1931):365-95.
- Simonet, F. *Glosario de voces ibéricas y latinas usadas entre los mozárabes*, Madrid, 1888.
- _____. *Historia de los mozárabes de España deducida de los mejores y más auténticos testimonios de los escritores christianos y árabes*, Madrid, 1903, rpt. Amsterdam, 1967.
- Simpósio Toledo hispanoárabe* (*Colegio Universitario*, 6-8 Mayo, 1982), no ed., Toledo, 1986.
- Sirat, C. *A History of Jewish Philosophy in the Middle Ages*, Cambridge & Paris, 1985.
- Southern, R. *Western Views of Islam in the Middle Ages*, Cambridge, MA, 1962.
- Speight, R. "The Function of *ḥadīth* as Commentary on the Qur'ān, as seen in the Six Authoritative Collections," in A. Rippin, ed., *Approaches to the History of the Interpretation of the Qur'ān*, Oxford, 1988, pp. 63-81.
- Suárez Fernández, L. *Historia de España: Edad media*, Madrid, 1970.
- Talbi, Mohamed. "Le Christianisme maghrébin de la conquête musulmane à sa disparition: une tentative d'explication," in Gervers and Bikhazi, eds., *Conversion and Continuity* (see above), pp. 313-51.
- Tolan, J. *Petrus Alfonsi and His Medieval Readers*, Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1993.
- Torres Balbás, L. "Mozarabías y juderías de las ciudades hispanomusulmanas," *al-Andalus* 19 (1954):172-97.
- Turki, A. "La lettre du «Moine de France» à al-Muqtadir Billāh, roi de Saragosse, et la réponse d'al-Bāyī, le faqīh andalou (présentation, texte arabe, traduction)," *al-Andalus* 31 (1966):73-153.
- _____. "Situation du 'tributaire' qui insulte l'Islam au regard de la doctrine et de la jurisprudence musulmanes," *Studia Islamica* 30 (1969):39-72.

- Tusquets, J. "Posicio de R. Lull en el problema del'eternitat del mon," *Criterion* 1 (1925):95-114.
- Urvoy, D. *Ibn Rushd (Averroes)*, London, 1991.
- _____. *Le monde des ulémas andalous du Ve/XIe au VIIe/XIIIe siècle. Étude sociologique*, Geneva, 1978.
- _____. "La pensée d'Ibn Tūmart," *Bulletin d'Études Orientales* 27 (1974):19-44.
- _____. "La pensée religieuse des Mozarabes face à l'islam," *Traditio* 39 (1983):419-32.
- _____. *Pensers d'al-Andalus: La vie intellectuelle à Cordoue et Seville au temps des empires berbères (fin XIe siècle - début XIIIe siècle)*, Toulouse, 1990.
- Urvoy, M.-Th. "La culture et la littérature arabe des chrétiens d'al-Andalus," *Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique* 92 (1991):259-75.
- _____. "Note de philologie Mozarabe," *Arabica* 36 (1989):235-36.
- Vajda, G. "Le kalām dans la pensée religieuse juive du Moyen Age," *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, 1973, pp. 143-60.
- van Koningsveld, P. "La apología de al-Kindī en la España del siglo XII. Huellas toledanas de un 'animal disputax,'" in *Estudios sobre Alfonso VI y la reconquista de Toledo* 3 (see above), pp. 107-29.
- _____. *The Latin-Arabic Glossary of the Leiden University Library. A Contribution to the Study of Mozarabic Manuscripts and Literature*, Leiden, 1976.
- _____. "La literatura cristiano-árabe de la España medieval y el significado de la transmisión textual en árabe de la *Collectio conciliorum*," in (no ed.) *Concilio III de Toledo. XIV Centenario, 589-1989*, Toledo, 1991, pp. 695-710.
- _____. "Petrus Alfonsi, een 12de eeuwse schakel tussen islam en christendom in Spanje," in *Historische betrekkingen tussen moslims en christenen*, ed. P. Sj. van Koningsveld, Nijmegen, 1982, pp. 127-46.
- von Grunebaum, G. *Medieval Islam* 2nd ed., Chicago, 1953, 1966.
- Wasserstein, D. *The Rise and Fall of the Party-Kings: Politics and Society in Islamic Spain, 1002-1086*, Princeton, 1985.
- Watt, W. *Bell's Introduction to the Qur'ān*, Edinburgh, 1970.
- _____. *The Formative Period of Islamic Thought*, Edinburgh, 1973.
- _____. *A History of Islamic Spain*, Edinburgh, 1965.
- Wensinck, A. *A Handbook of Early Muḥammadan Tradition, Alphabetically Arranged*, Leiden, 1927.
- Wensinck, A. et al. *Concordance et indices de la tradition musulmane*, 8 vols., Leiden, 1933-88.
- Wolf K. *Christian Martyrs in Muslim Spain*, Cambridge, 1988.
- _____. "Christian Views of Islam in Early Medieval Spain," in *Medieval Perceptions of Islam*, ed. J. Tolan, forthcoming from Garland Press, New York.
- _____. "The Earliest Latin Lives of Muḥammad," in Gervers and Bikhazi, eds., *Conversion and Continuity* (see above), pp. 89-101.
- Wolfson, H. *The Philosophy of the Kalam*, Cambridge, MA, 1976.
- Zayāt, H. "al-Asmā' wa-al-kunā wa-al-alqāb al-Naṣrānīyah fī al-Islām," *al-Mashriq* 42 (1948):1-21.

INDEX

- Abelard, Peter 79, 80, 82, 157, 160, 163, 177, 179, 181-88, 196, 198-204
- Abraham, (Biblical prophet) 344-45, 354-55, 366-67
- Abū Bakr, first caliph 278-79, 280-81
- Abū Dāwūd Sulaymān ibn al-Ash'ath al-Sijistānī 247n1, 253n4
- Aghushūn (Mozarabic polemicist) 80-84, 117-18, 123, 166-68, 171-73, 175, 180-81, 184, 188, 194, 196-97, 201-04; his *Maṣḥaf al-ʿālam al-kā'in* 80-84, 166-68, 194, 203
- ʿĀ'ishah (wife of Muḥammad) 130, 135-36, 150, 266-67, 280-81, 282-85
- Alcohol, Islamic proscription of 370-73
- Almohads 21, 64, 79, 191
- Almoravids 21, 64
- Alvarus, Paulus 14, 34, 93, 157
- Annotator (of Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, ms lat. 1162 containing Robert of Ketton's translation of the Qur'ān) 85-89, 107-08, 137-43, 147, 206, 208, 222
- Apology of al-Kindī* *see* *Risālat al-Kindī*
- Augustine, Bishop of Hippo 78, 80, 82, 83, 157, 159, 166n31, 175-76, 185, 201, 204
- Bahīrā (Christian monk of Islamic Tradition) 122, 222, 270-71
- al-Bājī, Abū al-Walīd 91
- al-Baṣrī, ʿAmmār 36, 119-20, 171, 197
- al-Bayḍāwī, ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿUmar 142, 255n6-257
- Bible 17, 66-69, 74, 86, 109, 117-20, 127, 131, 157, 161, 162
- Black Stone, the 364-69
- al-Bukhārī, Muḥammad ibn Ismāʿīl 54, 134-36, 146, 205, 206, 261nn2,4, 265n4, 267n7, 283n6, 291n3, 299n4, 321n2, 359n2, 373n4
- al-Burāq (Elberak, Muḥammad's miraculous horse) 376-383
- Christianity: Oriental 5, 15, 50, 90, 95, 98, 100, 103-04, 107-08, 112, 113, 114, 123, 129, 158, 160, 161, 162, 170-72, 194-95; Latin 68-70, 157-58, 160, 216
- Commentaries, Qur'ānic 42-46, 50, 54-55, 87, 89, 125, 130, 133, 136-38, 141-43, 147-50, 152-54, 195, 198, 207, 255nn3,6, 263n1, 267n5, 273n2, 275n2, 277n2, 283nn2,6, 285n5, 287n3, 291n3, 303n1, 307n9, 321n2, 335n7, 337n1, 341n6, 363n3, 367n5, 375n1, 377n6, 379nn1,3,5-6, 381n4
- Contrarietas alfolica* *see* *Liber denudationis*
- Conversion: Christianity to Islam 16, 53n64, 54, 55; Islam to Christianity 27, 53, 62; Judaism to Christianity 28
- Converso* Jews 7, 76-77, 89, 92, 94, 196, 210
- disciples of Jesus, Islamic beliefs about 360-61; comparison of with Muḥammad 300-03, 344-47
- Divorce, Islamic *see* *ṭalāq*
- Eulogius 33, 34, 157

- al-Fārisī, Salmān 270-71
Fi tathlith Allāh al-wāhid (On the Triune Nature of the One God, early-medieval Palestinian-Christian treatise) 112-14, 347n4
- Gabriel the archangel 264-65, 290-91, 376-81
Glossarium latino-arabicum 18, 73n126 148n83, 178, 182, 183nn89-90, 196, 289n3, 339n5, 359n1, 361nn4-5, 367n1, 369n2, 377n1, 385n1
- Ḥadīth/ḥadīths 40-46, 53, 55, 57, 124-25, 127-37, 139-40, 143-54, 195, 197, 205, 210, 225, 242-43, 244-47, 250-53260-63, 264-67, 274-75, 280-91, 298-99n4, 320-21n2, 322-23n1, 324-25n5, 326-27nn1,6, 330-31n2, 336-37n1, 356-57n1, 358-59n2, 362-63n3, 366-67n5, 372-73n4, 374-75n1, 376-83
- Ḥafsah bint 'Umar (wife of Muḥammad) 148, 149, 232, 280-81
- al-Ḥajjāj ibn Yūsuf, Abū Muḥammad 277, 365
- Ḥajj (pilgrimage to Mecca) 39, 44, 55, 128, 364-69
- Ḥamzah ibn 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib 263, 265
- Houris *see* al-Ḥūr
- Hugh of St. Victor 78, 178, 184-87
- al-Ḥūr (virgins of Paradise) 331n1
- Ibn al-Bar, Ḥafṣ 9, 14-15, 17, 35-36, 93, 99, 104, 158-60, 192
- Ibn al-Ḥakam, Marwān 230, 276-77
- Ibn Ḥanbal, Aḥmad 130, 132, 135, 145, 261n4, 299n4, 321n2, 333n5
- Ibn Ḥazm of Cordoba 50, 52, 54, 89, 90-91, 97, 102, 120n107, 123, 127n8, 131-133, 161-62, 184
- Ibn Hisham, Finḥās 270-71
- Ibn Iṣḥāq, Muḥammad 41, 46, 54, 153n101, 206, 271n2
- Ibn Kathīr al-Dimashqī, Abū al-Fidā' 140n55, 152, 207, 273n2, 285n5, 291n6-293, 303n1, 335n7, 337n1, 341n6, 357n1, 375n1, 377n6, 379nn1,3-4, 381n4
- Ibn Khidmah, Ḥabīb 95
- Ibn Sa'd, Muḥammad 150-51, 281n2, 283n2, 291n3
- Ibn Salām, 'Abd Allāh 270-71
- Ibn Tūmart, Muḥammad 26, 79, 80, 82
- Incarnation, Christian doctrine of 44, 62, 72, 73, 76, 81, 108, 110-115, 119, 121, 161, 256-57, 346-59
- al-Iṣfahānī, Dāwūd 246-49
- isnāds* (list of authorities verifying ḥadīths) 128, 130, 135-37, 144-47, 154, 244-47, 266-67
- 'Iyād ibn Mūsā (Qāḍī 'Iyād) 44, 129, 151, 375n1, 377n4,6, 379n3
- Jesus Christ 41, 43-44, 65, 73, 75, 86, 90, 104, 110-19, 127, 131-32, 139-42, 164; comparison of with Muḥammad 256-57, 338-39, 340-47; defense of Christian doctrine of 256-59, 344-51, 354-63; Qur'ānic statements about 314-17, 342-43, 356-57, 362-63; crucifixion 346-47 360-63; proof of his miracles 256-57, 344-51, 362-63
- Jews *see* *Converso* Jews
- al-Ka'bah (shrine in Mecca) 364-69
- Kalām* (Arabic philosophical theology) Muslim: 78-80, 168-72, 181-84, 196-97; Christian: 160, 163, 168-81, 188, 197, 198, 201-03; Jewish: 197
- al-Khazrajī, Aḥmad ibn 'Abd al-Ṣamad 36, 63-64, 67, 70, 83; his

- Maqāmīʿ al-sulbān* 36, 63-64, 67, 83, 253n4, 321n2, 347n7
- Kiṭāb al-ḥarāf* 93, 170
- Letter of al-Qūṭī* 22, 28, 62-70, 95, 103, 104, 106, 107, 109, 123, 133n27, 155, 317n1, 327n4, 351n1
- Lex Mahumet* (Robert of Ketton's Latin translation of the Qur'ān) *see* Qur'ān
- Liber denudationis siue ostensionis aut patefaciens* (alias *Contrarietas alfolica*) 6, 7, 28, 37-62, 89, 92, 95, 105-114, 118-23, 125, 143-47, 149-54, 160, 192, 194, 197, 204-08, 210, 215-39
- Lull, Ramon 6, 38n22, 46, 47, 62, 201-04, 207, 209-10, 216, 265n2
- Marc of Toledo 26, 62, 79, 199-00, 220
- Māriyah the Copt 42, 147-51, 280-81, 288-89
- Martí, Ramon 6, 46, 47, 48, 49, 54, 57-59; 153n101, 204-210, 216; his *Explanatio simboli apostolorum* 47, 48n45, 57-59, 207, 255nn2-3, 339n3; his *Quadruplex reprobatio* 47, 54, 153n101, 205-09, 245n2, 255nn2-3, 261n2, 283nn2,5, 293n3, 321n2, 339n3, 341n2
- Mary, mother of Jesus 312-17, 338-49
- Maṣḥaf al-ʿālam al-kā'in* *see* Aghushṭūn
- Miʿrāj* (Muḥammad's Night Journey) 41, 44, 152-53, 228, 229, 252-53, 266-69, 374-83
- Moses (Biblical prophet) 73, 81, 86, 115-20, 250-52, 294-95, 332-35, 254-55, 280-83
- Mozarabs: history of 1-3, 13-31; Arabicization 13-19, 26, 68, 198, 241n2, 251n1, 351n1; assimilation to Latin milieu 6, 19, 29-31, 188, 199-00, 209; Neo-Mozarabs 9, 19n26, 27, 94; New Mozarabs 9, 19n26, 94; meaning of term: 7-9
- Muḥammad, Prophet of Islam 34, 39-45, 51, 66-67, 69, 71, 85-86, 104-13, 121-22, 126-33, 138, 142-53, 197, 205-06, 222, 228-29, 231, 242-43; Christian views of: comparison of with Jesus 338-47; early sinful life 340-45; his supposed epilepsy 264-69; his experience of revelation 264-73; failure to work miracles 344-47, 383; his heretical knowledge of Bible 268-73; lustful nature 260-61, 280-93, 330-31; prophecies concerning him in Bible 254-55, 344-45; pseudo-prophet 250-57, 262-63, 268-69, 278-79, 298-99, 382-83; refutation of miracles attributed to him 266-69, 296-301, 318-27, 374-83; warlike nature 260-65, 298-99
- Muḥammad, Toledan translator 88
- Munkar and Nakīr (angels who visit the newly dead) 324-27
- al-Muqawqis 280-81, 288-89
- Muslim ibn Ḥajjāj al-Qushayrī 131, 133, 136n38, 144n64, 151nn91-92, 153nn101-02, 206, 267nn3,7, 321n2, 367n5, 375n1, 377n4
- Muslims: Christian views of 33-34, 47-49, 51-52, 65-68, 70, 85-94, 104-06, 109, 116-17, 126, 130, 136, 147
- al-Naṣībī, ʿIlīyā 51, 97, 101, 130
- Night Journey, Muḥammad's *see* *Miʿrāj*
- North Africa: Jews of 191, 197; Christians of 14, 15, 21, 191-94, 197, 200
- Orosius, Paulus *see* Ūrūsīūs
- Paradise, Christian attacks on Islamic views of 326-31

- Petrus Alfonsi 7, 40, 77, 92, 105-06, 121, 123
- Qur'ān 39-49, 51, 53-55, 57-59, 60-62, 66, 68, 69, 73-75, 80-81, 85-87, 104, 106, 109, 110, 112-17, 119-28, 130-31, 133-34, 136-42, 147, 170, 195, 197, 206, 210, 220, 224-25, 231; commentaries on *see* Commentaries, Qur'ānic; Robert of Ketton's translation of (*Lex Mahumet*) 84-89, 107, 123, 137, 139, 141-43, 198, 206, 208, 222; Christian views of: Christian polemical history of 274-79; offensive/self-contradictory contents of 246-47, 254-55, 274-75, 284-85, 294-95, 304-37, 370-71; refutation of miraculous nature of 276-79, 296-99, 300-03; revelation of to justify moral weakness of Muḥammad 280-91, 294-95; use of in anti-Islamic argumentation 242-43, 252-55, 274-77, 280-81, 292-95, 362-63
- al-Qurṭubī, Imām 35, 71, 72, 75-83, 93, 99, 102, 116, 134, 159, 166, 170, 173-75; his *al-Flām bi-mā fī dīn al-Naṣārā min al-faṣād* . . . 71, 99, 271nn1,3-4, 321n2, 323n1, 355n1
- al-Qurṭubī, Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad 138n41, 142n61, 267n5, 303n1, 357n1, 375n1, 379n5
- al-Qūṭī *see* *Letter of al-Qūṭī*
- Rabīʿ ibn Zayd *see* Recemundo
- Ramaḍān, fast of 310-11, 326-29
- Recemundo (*alias* Rabīʿ ibn Zayd), tenth-century bishop of Elvira 15, 97
- Richard of St. Victor 179, 201
- Riccoldo da Monte di Croce 44, 45-49, 62, 208, 216, 227-31, 235-36, 297n5; his *Contra legem saracenorum* 44, 45, 49, 208, 216, 227-31, 235-36, 293n5, 315n5-317, 351n3, 375n1, 387; his *Itinerarium*, 49, 208, 257n2, 273n4, 297n5, 317n1, 321n1, 377n4
- Risālat al-Kindī* 51, 95-96, 98-101, 105-07, 109, 121-23, 126, 129-31, 136-37, 153, 170-71, 195, 198, 204, 265n2, 271n1, 275n1, 277n6, 339n4
- Robert of Ketton 22, 54, 84-89, 107, 123, 137-43, 198, 208, 222; his translation of the Qur'ān *see* Qur'ān
- Sawdah bint Zam'ah (wife of Prophet) 286-87
- ṣifāt (attributes of God) 79, 165, 169, 182
- Speraindeo 33, 34
- al-Ṭabarānī, Ibrāhīm (Abraham the Tiberiade) 97, 98n14, 99nn16,19, 101n33, 103-04, 113n81, 118n96
- al-Ṭabarī, Muḥammad ibn Jarīr 46, 131, 138-42, 148-51, 255n3, 271n1, 273n2, 275n2, 281n2, 283nn2,6, 285n5, 287n3, 291n3, 321n2, 335n7, 341n6, 363n3, 367n5-369, 375n1, 377n6
- tahrīf* (Muslim belief that Christian's corrupted their scriptures) 108-09, 250-59
- Taifa kingdoms 19
- ṭalāq 106-07, 290-91
- Tathlīḥ al-wahdāntīyah* 22, 28, 54, 69-82, 93, 95, 100-02, 104, 106, 115-18, 123, 131, 133-34, 136-38, 146, 154-55, 161, 163-66, 168, 170-77, 180-81, 184-88, 194, 196-97, 199, 201-04, 210
- Timothy I, Nestorian Catholicos of Baghdad 67, 97, 98-99, 101, 121, 123
- Toledo: Reconquest of 22-24; religious pluralism of 13, 18, 20, 22, 25-26; French settlers

- of 23-25; Castillian settlers of 23, 25, 26; Jews of 23-25, 27; Mozarabs of 14, 19, 22-25, 28-29, 68; population of in 11th and 12th centuries 19, 22, 23
- Trinity, Christian doctrine of 17, 34, 69, 72-73, 81-82, 91, 93, 99-01, 103-04, 108, 110-15, 121, 158-81, 182-89, 202-204, 346-49
- al-Ṭūṣī, Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan 137, 139, 263n1, 273n2,
- ʿUmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb 264-65
- Ūrūsīūs (Paulus Orosius) 192
- Vitalis, Orderic 1, 7, 17, 209
- al-Zamakhsharī, Maḥmūd ibn ʿUmar 139n48, 150n88, 151, 255n6-257, 263n1, 273n2, 321n2
- Zayd ibn Ḥārithah 42, 68-69, 105, 106, 288-91
- Zayd ibn Thābit 274-79
- Zaynab bint Jaḥsh (wife of Muḥammad) 42, 68-69, 105, 106, 206, 288-91